THE ORIENT QUESTION

PRINCE
LAZAROVICH
HREBELIANOVICH

D 463 .L3
Lazarovich-Hrebelianovich, Stephan Lazar Eugene, Prince, 1874-
The Orient question to-day and to-morrow

THE ORIENT QUESTION

TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW

THE ORIENT QUESTION
TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW

BY
PRINCE LAZAROVICH-HREBELIANOVICH

ILLUSTRATED WITH MAPS

NEW YORK
DUFFIELD & COMPANY
1913

D
463
.23

Copyright, 1913, by
DUFFIELD & COMPANY

To those heroes who fell in the liberation of the old lands from the Turk, whether among the regular and auxiliary forces of the Allies, or those Haiduks, Klephts, and Comitadjis of the insurrections who fought hoping only in a distant future. Counting as nothing unutterable hardship, they won victories unsurpassed in the world's annals, giving their lives as Christ did, that others might live.

The loving remembrance of their glory will be chanted forever, and their noblest monuments will be the creations of the genius of their race which, in splendour and might will now arise in the home-lands freed from blight and consecrated anew to bless the Earth.

FOREWORD

This book is based on lectures which I delivered at Leland Stanford Junior University, California, U. S. A., just prior to the outbreak of the Balkan war in the autumn of 1912, at the request of President David Starr Jordan, whose proposal to study the subjects of war and peace by scientific methods promises a trustworthy basis for the formation of practical conclusions.

The title of the lectures was "Servian Unification a Factor in World Peace." They included a consideration of the various international problems of the Near and Far East and their relation to the interests centred in the Balkan regions.

It was not my good fortune to have my proffered services as a soldier in the field required by the Servian Government. That restraint caused me profound sorrow,

as since the founding of the first Macedonian Committee in 1886 for the freeing of the Christians from the Turk in the old Serb-lands, I have devoted the greater part of my life to that cause.

When I realised that circumstances made it impossible for me to take part with the armies in this most glorious campaign I decided to remain in America and speak on the Balkan situation, which I have done before Universities and other Educational institutions.

LAZAROVICH-HREBELIANOVICH.

March, 20, 1913.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	General Considerations	1
II.	Near Eastern Problem	76
	A. General Survey	76
	B. Islâm	82
	C. Local Aspect of the Near Eastern Problem	106
	D. International Aspect of the Near Eastern Problem	172
III.	The Far Eastern and Pacific Situation	202
IV.	The American Problems	249
V.	European Problems of International Importance	264
	A. The Anglo-German Situation	264
	B. The Hapsburg Problem	289
	Appendix:	
	A. A letter to the Servian People published in the Belgrade and other Servian Newspapers, in March, 1912	317
	B.	
	1. Citations from Memorandum of Macedonian Committee to British Government, November, 1903	325
	2. Citations from Memorandum of Macedonian Committee to King Edward and British Government, Spring, 1904	333
	C. Danube-Aegean Canal Project, Estimates, Surveys, etc., as submitted to Servian Government in 1909	349

MAPS

		FACING PAGE
1.	Map of the World	24
2.	Map of the Near East, having the Suez-Canal as center	150
3.	Map of the Far East	210
4.	Map of America, having the Panama Canal as center	250
5.	Distribution of the different races in Austria-Hungary and the Balkans	290
6.	Map showing the Serb-inhabited Block of Territory	303
7.	The existing Inland Waterways of Central Europe navigable for boats of 1000 tons, and the Projected Danube-Aegean Canal Appendix	355

THE ORIENT QUESTION

CHAPTER I

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

THE immutable, underlying factors of the Balkan Problem constitute it an integral and important part of the world problems formed by the conflicting or inter-mutual interests which vibrate between Suez and Panama.

The Balkan Peninsula in its relation to Suez forms the most important key from the Occident to the Orient and the vast Oriental markets. Apart from those far-reaching and basic elements of the Balkan situation, the problems which are now being fought out not only on the Macedonian battle-fields, but in the Council Chambers of the world would have but restricted and local import.

Therefore a true understanding of the Balkan situation calls for some consideration of the so-called world aims, aspirations and interests of the great nations and the points where those aims converge and conflict. What is seen in the Balkan Problem to-day is not alone a Serb, a Bulgar, a Greek, or a Turk, but also a German, an Englishman, a Russian.

A real and definitive settlement of the Balkan question is possible as the result of the campaigns of the Balkan Allies, but such a definitive solution of that question is possible only on the basis of the "Balkans for the Balkans." That result would bring calm to one of the great storm-centres of Europe, where perennial strife and uncertainty must be pregnant with peril to the world. Incidentally, such a firm settlement would mean civilisation and progress to millions of people inhabiting those lands. But, whatever the outcome on the battle-field, it is to be feared that the peace-settlement un-

der outside pressure will not be a settlement in the interests of peace, insuring stability, but that a make-shift will be arrived at leaving the situation full of open questions, door-ways through which a northern conqueror shall be able at a convenient hour to stride eastward and southward to Suez and to the attainment of that world mastery proclaimed in the inscriptions found on the palaces of the Hapsburgs — "Austria Est Imperare Orbi Universo."

The present war is the last episode or last phase of a struggle which was begun by the Ottoman Turks five hundred years ago when they invaded Europe and overthrew the then existing Servian, Bulgarian, and Greek States. In driving back the Turk to-day the Allies do not enter the land as conquerors, they are going home.

A nation never loses its sovereignty. Individuals, bound together in community by ties of blood, language and traditions forming a nation, have the inherent right

to choose their form of government, the right to mould their own destiny, the right to create guarantees to life, happiness and virtue. The right to live, to be good and to be happy is the inalienable birthright of the individual human being. To guarantee the full exercise of these rights to the individual is the duty of the nation. So too, has it the duty to demand and exact general recognition of those inalienable rights. A government which fails in that regard has lost its claim to existence, and the individual, the ultimate unit forming the nation has the right of recall, to be enforced, by peaceful means if possible, or, if need be, by violence — the right of revolution.

Conquest does not abolish the sovereignty of a nation. That sovereignty is only held in abeyance while the rule of the conqueror lasts, and remains in abeyance only so long as the militant force of the conqueror is strong enough to prevent its assertion. It is the right and the duty of

a subjugated nation to revolt against and overthrow its conqueror. In that militant action lies the proof of its morality as a nation and of the honesty of its component individuals. Instance of this is furnished in the history of every conquered nation. Vice and corruption prepare for and invite conquest — vice and corruption maintain a nation in subjection.

The Balkan peoples inhabiting the lands which had been over-run and held in forcible subjection by the Turk proved their mettle by remaining in insurrection either latent or active according to opportunity during several hundred years. Over these lands for five centuries hovered the Balkan vulture and multiplied for there was food for him; there was an endless cry of battle, an endless groan of the oppressed and tortured — an endless death-moan. The sign of mastership of the wild hordes of Islam was massacre unavenged by Christendom. Where the arts of peace had flourished, where material and moral

well-being and learning had existed, for five hundred years the Turks spread waste and darkness.

Slowly one by one the Balkan peoples were able to partially free themselves and re-constitute part of their ancient States.

Montenegro, a remnant of the old Servian Empire, was never entirely conquered by the Ottomans.

In the dawn of the Nineteenth Century, following massacres of Servians by the Turks in the Pashalik of Belgrade the sturdy mountaineer Karageorge, in 1804, headed a revolution and freed that part of what had been Servia, followed by another mountaineer, Milosh Obrenovich. After eleven years of war the modern principality — later the Kingdom of Servia was founded. In 1821, after Turkish massacres of Greeks, the standard of revolt was raised in Greece and in 1830 the modern Kingdom of Greece was founded. In 1878, Russia, after the Bulgarian atrocities, swept the Turks from the old Bul-

garian lands and created modern Bulgaria. These four States, now the allied powers, were only fragments of their old territories. In European Turkey the Ottoman still held sway over their brethren — the Serb, the Bulgar, the Greek.

What is being witnessed to-day by the world in the re-entering into possession of their old lands by the Balkan Nations, is the final tearing up of the one-sided contract made by the Ottoman Turk for the Balkan Nations, when the Turks as conquerors overthrew them and imposed on them their rule. That war is the contest between sovereignties, the one legitimate, the other imposed by usurpation.

The idea of world peace has entered vividly into the conceptions and even into the militant movements of the present time. Many minds have thrilled with the question as to whether the human race may not have entered the age when the sword is to be fused into the ploughshare, and

the lamb lie down in peace with the lion. It is hoped that war can be made rare or perchance with the evolution of a higher human nature, eliminated. The eyes of faith which look forward afar to that period of a higher level of humanity, behold, too, the elimination of another kind of war, one intimately at the base of the armed strife between nations, namely the war between the "haves" and "have-nots," when starvation and the misery of economic slavery shall have disappeared.

The matter of peace should be studied with scientific method. There must be examination of data and conclusions based as nearly as possible, if not on experiments, at least on human experience.

World peace as a practical achievement cannot be approached in our day by robbing peoples of the conceptions of self-defence, but by the establishment of equilibrium between the interests of nations and the calming and eradication of storm-centres. In this way Germany and

Italy for example, which, for hundreds of years as weak and dismembered communities, were the battle-fields of Europe, have within the space of a single generation, through their unification, become powerful States, and within their boundaries the old weak and disrupted conditions, representing a kind of moral vacuum, drawing to themselves the inrushing expansive forces of their ambitious and stronger neighbours, have disappeared, so making serenity in a centre where storms were wont to gather. Conditions similar in that regard to those which existed in Italy and Germany prior to their unification as well as others peculiar to Turkish misrule have long existed in the Balkan Peninsula, making that part of the world a centre of continual disturbance and therefore dangerous to general peace. The unification and confederation of the several peoples of the Balkans in a free and independent formation will eradicate the causes of disturbance in that centre. On page 728 of the

second volume of "The Servian People, Their Past Glories, and Their Destiny," [1] published two years prior to the present war, occur the following words: "All the lessons to be drawn from history would indicate to ordinary political sagacity that in the unification of each of the Balkan races, lies the solution of the Near Eastern Question. The unification of the Serbs, the Bulgars, the Roumanians, and Greeks into homogeneous entities would be the most potent factor in any approach to intelligent co-operation for individual defence and development."

The vital result of the present war, important thereby to the world as a peace factor, is precisely that unification of the several Balkan States:— The Serbs and Montenegrins liberating from Turkish occupation their old lands and unifying with their co-nationals who form the population

[1] The Servian People, Their Past Glories and Their Destiny, by Prince and Princess Lazarovich-Hrebelïanovich, New York, Ch. Scribner & Sons; London, Werner Laurie.

of those lands, the Bulgarians, doing the same in adjacent territories inhabited by Bulgars, and the Greeks, re-acquiring old Greek inhabited lands. So their leaguing together permanently for common economic interests and foreign relations becomes possible for the first time in modern days and constitutes a new Balkan Power strong enough to defend the territorial integrity and the national interests of each and all.

A live man must fight in this world, whether in actual bloody warfare in defence of his home-land, or personally in battle against adverse circumstances, or again in the service of an ideal. When battle shall no longer be attended by spilled lives on blood-stained fields, the clash of ideas and vital life-forces will continue a warfare in the human attempt to try out the value of such forces and assert supremacies in the region of the intellect. Strife is the primordial law of nature; we must

look that fact squarely in the face; the principle governs all forms of creation, from the lowest up to the highest,— the struggle to survive, the struggle to win ever higher and to keep what has been won, to hold that which is conquered and possessed. The struggle for survival, the struggle for existence, cannot be eradicated by man-made disciplinary laws, but only by a series of conditions, by the creation or modification of conditions. It is the misery born of this struggle of existence which socialism and its theories attempt to remedy. So, also the various peace and arbitration plans seek to remedy the conditions of intercourse between the nations. Both sets of theories have hitherto brought but lame advance. Though both are imbued with the highest and sublimest of ideals, they assume that man-made law can stem the course of nature, and both in their methods have hitherto largely ignored the basic laws of nature underly-

ing that contest. As there are means to create conditions in a community to make the struggle for existence easier for the individual, and to find those means the antecedents of the individual are studied to discover if heredity has not placed a handicap on him, while his domestic life, his needs and his opportunities form the subjects of investigation, so, too, the same principles apply to the study of nations. It is their home conditions, the conditions within themselves and their needs, or their imagined needs — their greeds, which bring about strife.

Supported by history it can be said in general, that all wars between nations, all civil upheavals, all mighty social violences of whatever nature, have had at base whether apparent or obscure, an economical grievance, or a commercial ambition. Back even of the so-called religious wars were causes partaking largely of the same character.

At the base of every real revolution is a loaf of bread, and commerce is a latent state of war.

The methods of commerce inextricably bound up to-day with the foreign policies of nations, are by reason of competition in all its factors, essentially combative. Military action therefore may be but an extension, a consequence, not the breach but the continuity, of those methods. Investigation shows that whenever two nations go to war they have been for decades or perhaps centuries advancing on lines of interest which are convergent. If for some reason this clash of interests becomes vital, a matter of life or death, the struggle of survival enters, war becomes cheaper than peace for one or the other of the two. The elements which determine the question of the struggle for survival, lie at home, in the facts conditioning the livelihood of the members of the nation.

Communities or nations in their different stages of youth, manhood and decay

The King's Library

seem to follow the ebb and flow of periods similar to those of individual human life, and the cycle of their years includes within its rhythm, times of weakness and illness as well as epochs of health and mastery, a constructive age and the hour of dissolution; and the nature of what was builded proclaims the measure of a race's immortality. So it seems to have been from time immemorial as witnessed eloquently by "the glory that was Greece, the grandeur that was Rome," by the moral conquests of certain civilisations asserting for human dignity, and by the silent monuments and remains of the old buried cities of races long forgotten, recounting their shattered dreams to the archeologist who digs up their broken columns and arches in Asia, Africa, Europe and the Americas. The stories told by the Egyptian priests to Solon, retold by Plato, echo the same ancient tale.

As the scientific study of the economics of life lead to finding means to ease the

struggle for life of the individual, so a scientific study of the underlying real causes of war must lead to the knowledge of laws which nature has laid down for the intercourse of nations, and so perhaps means will be discovered which will make war a thing of extreme rarity.

It has been well ascertained that the basic condition essential to the development of individuals is liberty. The same is true of races, and only when a State is the expression of the entity and totality of one nation, capable of formulating the genius of that nation, can it guarantee true liberty to its citizens, and progress on a sound basis. Such a basis alone, can provide for the moral and material needs of the community, establishing a trustworthy equilibrium between desire and the power of attainment, therefore possessing the confidence of the citizens.

Working agreements providing guarantees of enduring international peace are possible between such States.

Should there rise to mind cases of a State composed of individuals representing a wide diversity of races as in the United States, it must also be admitted that only when such individuals, as a result of the melting-pot process, or of their own free will, accept for their own a common national ideal, can the State hope for stability or clearness of expression. That process of absorption and assimilation has been found possible concerning individuals in immigration, but not when attempted in regard to large masses of different races, especially when they form the homogeneous population of whole provinces which have been forcibly wrenched from a neighbouring national State.

The impulse of communities of the same race to unify themselves into one State is the simple tendency towards intelligent formulation found in all nature, and is a highly moral act in the interest of national eugenics.

The completing of a national State to

include all the members of its race is a necessary and constructive step towards the attainment of world-peace on a righteous foundation.

The subject under discussion is not the possibility of abolishing war but the examination of the international problems from which war might conceivably arise.

The geographical features of the earth, the configuration of the continents, the distribution of land and sea, the climateric conditions and their influences on the growth of plant and animal life, the riches of the soil, the mineral wealth of the subsoil, are the primordial factors to determine or influence the life and development of a people. To those must be added the facilities for communications and the interchange of the necessities or luxuries of life, as well as the genius or mentality inherent in a people, that is, its balance or equilibrium of mind which finds

expression in its political and social development, its thought, its religious life, its soul-life. All those factors have to be taken into account in studying the future of a nation or race and their consideration is necessary to an understanding of its present, and indicate regions in both the material and moral spheres, where the interests of that nation become vital.

The geographical configuration of the earth's surface has driven staves, so to speak, to mark points where the interests of nations shall clash, where the "cockpits" of that clash shall be. Certain points of the earth's surface are by their situation, regions where the interests of two or more nations come into conflict, and whose possession confers dominant importance. Those points and zones form the natural storm-centres of the world.

Napoleon said: "War is a business of positions," and the military value of positions fix the geographical situation of the international problems which are of world

importance and which link up all of the great interests of all the great powers and interweave them into one pattern; and no one of these great international problems can be solved or even modified without affecting in some point or other the status of the other problems.

The first necessity of the economic development of a community is the means of intercourse or communication with other communities. The raw material required for its industries if not for food itself, must often come from afar; the surplus of production must find an outer market; the livelihood of the community might depend on the sale of its manufactured products, and modern industrialism has imposed that need on many nations. The roads to such markets must be safe and secure, the competitive power of other nations must be met, and as commerce is never so secure and untrammeled as under its own flag, the roads leading to those necessary markets or even those markets

themselves must be controlled. The vital principle of this control demands political supremacy, which in turn depends upon a strong military land and sea power able to occupy and hold the strategic points commanding such roads and markets, or to dominate such lands or peoples considered as desirable markets.

Over-production of human material, calling for new territory whereupon to settle over-flow of population, causes an expansion, under the inavoidable impulse of nature, operated in migrations of peoples or the more deliberate form of colonisation.

The Japanese author, Statesman and Privy Councillor, Baron Kaneko, says: "In the twentieth century it is the increase and expansion of international commerce that guides the policies of nations."— He says further:—"All nations are looking for new markets for their industries, and the only market now remaining which can

be exploited with benefit is the continent of Asia."

Looking at the world's map and bearing in mind that water, whether by ocean, lake or river, affords the cheapest means of commercial intercourse, the shortest and cheapest routes from the great industrial centres of Europe and America, to the markets of Asia, are seen to lie through the two artificial passages connecting the oceans, the Suez Canal and the Panama Canal. The two mighty nerve-ganglia of the world political problems of to-day, lie, one in the eastern Mediterranean, one in the Caribbean Sea; both positions command a narrow canal, and are vast lanes of the world's commerce. The eastern Mediterranean to-day, and the Caribbean to-morrow, must necessarily be the centres around which the interests and the attention of the world must revolve.

A third situation of straits of future significance and potentiality lies in the East Indian Archipelago between Australia and

the southeastern Asia, forming a kind of sea-divide between the Indian Ocean and the Pacific.

The SUEZ CANAL is not only the important eastern gate of the Mediterranean, of which Gibraltar is the door to the west, Malta, the watch-tower of the centre, the Dardanelles and Bosphorus, the entrance-ways to the Black Sea washing the shores of Russia, but the Suez Canal is the centre of a region including the Balkans in the north, the Persian Gulf and Caspian Sea in the east, and Aden, closing the Red Sea, in the south, where are grouped a number of positions of military, therefore political value, which based one upon another control Southeastern Europe, and open thence a gate northward on one side, and on the other, dominate southern Asia, India and its ocean.

That region towards which for the past one hundred years has been more and more closely converging the interests of

all western nations, has been in its main problems, the core of what is known as the Orient Question. The Orient Question whether under the guise of Turkish, Armenian, Egyptian, or Persian, has always in reality, been the one titanic contest of England with Russia, England striving ever in defence of India.

The naval base, Gibraltar, doorkeeper of the Mediterranean was acquired by England in the early eighteenth century when she fought France for supremacy in the Atlantic. The Cape of Good Hope was acquired during the French revolution and British guard placed at that naval base to watch the passage from the Atlantic eastward to the Indian Ocean. When Napoleon pointed a way to India across Egypt, England acquired Malta, as a strong naval base and point of warning midway in the Mediterranean, and at the southern extremity of the Red Sea at the straits of Bab-el-Mandeb, England erected the fortress of Aden. With the piercing

of Suez she acquired Cyprus and the control of Egypt.

The great positions of military and political value in that part of the world are: Egypt, dominating Suez and the Red Sea; in the Balkan Peninsula: Constantinople, (Dardanelles, Bosphorus), Salonika and the Servian Plateau comprising the Basin of Nish — the point of junction of the great natural highways of the Balkan Peninsula. Of supreme importance is the possession of the Servian Plateau, opening the door to Europe northward, and the roads southward to Salonika, and eastward to Constantinople. The possession of the Servian Plateau for which the Turks had fought the Servians for 150 years, allowed them in the year 1526 with the single battle of Mohacs to become the masters of Hungary and within a few short weeks to stand at the gates of Vienna. It was the possession of the Servian Plateau which made it possible for the Balkan allies in the present war to so

swiftly and completely clear their old lands from the Turks. It is the conquest of the Servian plateau which is the object of the relentless intrigues of Austria making pretext of Albania in the present crisis.

Again looking across the Bosphorus towards the Orient the situation of Constantinople (Bosphorus, Dardanelles) forms the apex of a triangle of positions, including the Armenian Plateau and Adana commanding the passes across the Taurus and Anti-Taurus. Supreme in importance of these is the Armenian Plateau. That region commands the land-ways opening southward to the Gulf of Alexandretta through Syria to Suez, and the two long road-ways, one eastward across Persia to Herat and beyond through Afghanistan, the other, by the valleys of the Euphrates and Tigris toward the Persian Gulf, giving access to southern Persia, southern Afghanistan, and Baluchistan towards India. To those antique roads came Alexander the Great from Macedonia, and along

them he carried his triumphs up to the foot of the Pamirs to the springs of the Tarim, where his empire touched China. He reached Merv, called of old "Antiochia Margitana," and Herat, called "Alexandria of Aria." By the long south way he passed Babylon, the Persian Gulf, Susa, and Persepolis. From Alexandretta in Syria he marched down to Egypt. In modern times as in the day of the great Macedonian, the Armenian Plateau still commands the way to Persia, to India and to Egypt. As the Armenian Plateau lies under the shadow of the Russian hand, so too, in the eastern Mediterranean, Adana and the Gulf of Alexandretta,[1] lie

[1] It is interesting to note that the river Orontes emptying into the Gulf of Alexandretta, is at a certain part of its course parallel with the Euphrates, low ridges only separating the two rivers and the distance of division between them measuring only about 50 miles. That situation was picturesquely illustrated by the English Colonel Chesney in 1834 who steered two Steamboats named *Tigris* and *Euphrates* up the Orontes river thence had them carried across the dividing ridges and floated on the river Euphrates which they

well under the guns of the British naval base of Cyprus.

As the Suez Canal gave to the Mediterranean a new importance, so the PANAMA CANAL bestows upon the Caribbean Sea and the Gulf of Mexico an importance beyond any they hitherto possessed. The Panama Canal not only provides a shortened lane for the world's commerce across the oceans, with value not to be computed in the development of the western coasts of both Americas, but again suggestive of analogy with Suez, Panama will be a new point where East and West shall meet. That transection of the thin thread of land by which nature had joined the two vast Americas, considered locally, severs and at the same time brings into closer communion two types of civilisation, the Anglo-Saxon in the north, the Hispano-Latin in the

navigated down to the Persian Gulf. The Colonel's enterprise suggested another possible waterway from the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf.

south. As the Mediterranean from of old was the mother of civilisation in that part of the Eastern Hemisphere, so in the west the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea, two sister basins enclosed within coast-lines of North, Central and South America on three sides, and by their interlocking chains of islands on the fourth, stretching from Trinidad to Key West, a barrier of protection to inhibit or control the passage of their waters by fleets seeking course from the Atlantic to the Pacific, so too, those twin seas like their elder sister of Europe are destined to become the progenitrices and guardians of new and mighty civilisations. From those islands, of the West Indies, forming the first discovery of western lands, the Spaniards carried their conquests to the ajacent continents, and already, at first sight as it were, the mingling of the waters of the two mighty oceans was proposed by the men who first stood and gazed afar with both Atlantic and Pacific at their feet.

First the Dutch, then the French and then the English, came and fought with the Spaniard for a share of his amazing discoveries, then battled among themselves. From those days of the Buccaneers and the Spainsh Main, and contest for supremacy on the Atlantic, England emerged with Trinidad, Jamaica, British Honduras (on the mainland), connected by intervening isles in an almost continuous chain from Honduras to the mouth of the Orinoco, and stretching far northward and eastward with the Bahamas and Bermuda into the Atlantic. The Dutch still retain Curaçao, the French, some of the Antilles. The last of the Spanish heirs was the United States, receiving Puerto Rico with vested interests in Cuba.

The island positions, commanding the canal and forming its natural defences on the Atlantic side are: the natural island fortresses of Jamaica and Curaçao, and Cuba derives its importance from its prox-

imity to Florida. Still another point in the Caribbean of potential value as naval base, lies in Santo Domingo or possibly in St. Thomas. In the Pacific Ocean the defences of the Panama Canal are in the position of the Galapagos Islands and the Hawaii.

Midway of the seas between Suez and Panama, dividing the Indian Ocean from the Pacific, the EAST INDIAN ARCHIPELAGO lies like a broken bridge between Australia and the southeastern coast of Asia. The Straits of Singapore and the narrow passages between the Isles command the approaches from the Indian Ocean, the Pacific and the Chinese coast. The position of first military value is occupied by the Philippine Islands, dominating the passages of the Straits, the Chinese Sea and coast-line. The important naval bases of the region are in the hands of the Dutch, of the English, keeping watch over the tracks to India, and of the Americans

with the Philippines as advance-post to the Chinese markets. The islands of the Archipelago are rapidly becoming the centre of interest far in excess of any they have hitherto possessed and the mouth of the Shelde and Rhine in Europe may some day hold for them a word of destiny. The advent of Japan has already enhanced their significance as their possession would give to that Power complete control of Eastern Asia and a supremacy in that part of the world which could not be challenged by any nation or combination of nations.

The two canal routes, Suez and Panama and the straits of the East Indian Archipelago are the points of junction and intersection of world commerce, the trade lanes of nations; and the ambitions of one or more powers to own or command those gates in the interest of special individual advantages either economical, or political, or both, arouse international contest for the

points of vantage controlling those gateways.

Two Island groups by the fortune of the geographical situation they occupy in relation to adjacent continents and their oceans, have been and are by destiny the makers of history. They are: the BRITISH ISLES, on the Atlantic coast of the Eurasian continent, and the JAPANESE ISLES on the Pacific shores of that continent.

Their geographical position gives to the British Isles the practical command of the west coast of Europe, they flank the trade routes of the Atlantic, dominate the French Atlantic sea roads, and entirely control the German, Dutch and Baltic trade routes.

The same relative position in the Pacific is occupied by Japan, who dominates the Eastern Asiatic coast and all approaches to northern China.

Both Great Britain and Japan are by

geographical fiat, naval powers of the first order. To both, one in the Atlantic, the other in the Pacific, naval supremacy is the condition of their existence as great powers. Each found its adversary, and later in that adversary its ally, on the opposite neighbouring continental shore. The Anglo-German-French situation parallels at many points the Japanese-Chinese-Russian situation.

As the erection of a powerful Germany and France's abasement bore the force of a disaster for England, so in the Pacific an aggressive China would bear the nature of defeat for Japan and Russia. As England found a natural ally in her former foe, France, so Japan finds her natural ally in Russia, her former antagonist.

The naval supremacy of the Pacific must ever be in the hands of whatever Pacific power possesses the great strategic naval bases of the HAWAIIAN ISLANDS in the centre of the ocean.

The problems and the forms in which they present themselves to us to-day, are not the results of accidental occurrences or conditions arisen in a single night, nor yet of the momentary caprice of statesmen, but they are phases of movements occupying perhaps hundreds of years in the course of their development, and the successive events of which will be found to have been intimately bound up with the prosperity, if not of the very existence of the nations they affect.

British history furnishes the most vivid illustration of these postulates bearing on the Oriental Question. The British world situation has its origin in those occurrences that took place in England's interior history several hundreds of years ago, moulding English insular life of that time and imposing and forcing forward an aggressive foreign policy and the participation of England as instigator, patron or active co-operator in the field, in most of the wars from the Elizabethan age to

the present time. Profiting by these contests between nations and bringing forth from them trophies for herself, she became and remained during the Nineteenth Century the foremost power of the world.

This consummation was not due to the action based on shrewd foresight and a distinct preconcerted plan of one or more great statesmen, but was the natural consequence of steady and ceaseless pressure of general conditions in England. No statesmen or group of men were able to foresee or judge what the ultimate goal would be. Her paramount world position was attained by a series of actions each occasioned by a necessity of the time, and each bringing others in its train. During the whole period not one statesman (although England possessed since the days of Elizabeth her dynasty of Crown-ministers in the Cecils) was fully conscious of the attainment that was being wrought, or who pre-conceiving the apogee of British supremacy, had the genius to mould

the elements by a masterful policy that would abridge the slow construction of centuries and accomplish the majestic purpose within a single generation, such as were the mighty creations of Cavour and Bismark, which changed the face of Europe and raised up new world factors.

With nations as with individuals there is a sub-conscious cerebration which is far more infinite and more inexorable in its working than is the apparent and conscious ego. It is that which goes tirelessly on while individuals or nations wake or sleep, and influencing their actions and their tendencies.

Lord Roseberry, in his "Questions of Empire" page 27, says in regard to Russian policy and advance: ". . . the policy of Russia . . . is practically unaffected by the life of man or the lapse of time, it moves on as it were by its own impetus. It is silent, concentrated, perpetual, and unbroken, it is therefore successful."

The same is true in some degree of

every race and nation. The individual statesman does not create or destroy this impetus without causing the whole fabric to rock on its foundations. His sole power lies, according to the measure of his perceptive capacity in regard to this sub-conscious mind of the nation, in being able either clumsily or skilfully to forward or retard the forces at work.

The phase of a problem whose solution may to-day or to-morrow become imminent, numbers among its dynamic elements the necessity of prompt and resolute action in relief of some irresistible pressure, and the power and perfection of the national machinery for the executive accomplishment of such purpose.

It has been said that ENGLAND is the Venice of the earth and her streets are the oceans.

The beginning of the nineteenth century found England the possessor of a world empire on whose territories as the proud

British boast is, " the sun never sets "; they belt the earth, and her ships sailing the universal seas are always in touch with British shores. The statement is often made and believed that England for centuries has been ruled by an aristocracy,—but British aristocracy is, and has always been, a thing largely of the people, for it has almost entirely sprung from trade and been nurtured by trade. Englishmen make the vaunt that a British boy from the humblest social strata may aspire to sit " on the Woolsack " (be Lord Chancellor of England) and attain the goal of his ambitions " if he have it in him." Certain it is that in Great Britain those who rise to the " Woolsack " may have begun life by shearing the sheep, or tending it, or making market of yarn or mutton. In this the comparison between England and the Queen of the Adriatic becomes apt. The greatness of Venice, too, was the ennobling of trade.

The greater part of the soil in Eng-

land which in former times was tilled agriculturally has been more and more abandoned to become grazing lands or to be absorbed into large pleasure estates. To-day seventy-seven per cent. of the population live in the cities and are dependent for their sustenance on the industries which developed the mineral and other resources of the soil with the aid of that abundant and cheap labour. These economic conditions which began with the general use of steam and machinery, were the causes of radical political changes in English constitutional life. The country is at present, on account of the general decline of agriculture, dependent for its nourishment upon the importation of food-stuffs, statistics showing that at any given time the British Isles have never on hand more than a food supply sufficient to meet the requirements of the nation for three weeks.

It was upon England's merchant marine that her ocean empire was founded, therefore free-trade made of England the

world's sea-carrier and her great ports, Liverpool, Hull, Southampton, and especially London, centres of world commerce and the clearing-houses of the produce of the nations.

With the sudden rise of England's neighbour, Germany, and the development of German industries and trade, the continental harbours of Hamburg, Rotterdam and Antwerp at the mouth of the Shelde and the Rhine, opposed to English trade and industries a formidable rival.

The heavy pressure of this foreign competition has a disturbing influence on English interior conditions, and imposes the consideration of certain principles on British foreign policy. The aim of that policy must ever be in defending the interests of the British Isles, the defence of India, as the key-stone of their over-sea empire, and the reconstruction of the colonies into a "Zoll-verein" according to the Chamberlain proposal, or into some other type of federation.

India, the richest field of colonial exploitation in the world, indifferent through the ages as to the land of origin of its imperial Over-lord, therefore always a lure to the foreign conqueror and always under the supreme sway of foreign rule down to the Moguls and the British, India is the greatest of British continental possessions.

During the past hundred years the whole British foreign policy has been directed as a chief object towards the defence of India. England's other conquests, Canada, Australia and South Africa, have become autonomous States which appear to be slowly moving toward consolidation with the mother-country into a unified empire, no longer colonial, but composed of members of equal independence.

Apart from that mighty consolidation, the two poles in the preservation of the British Empire are the secure possession of India and the maintenance of British

naval supremacy able to protect the economic position of the British Isles among nations.

Russia, forming the northern half of the Eurasian Continent, an ice-blocked ocean on either hand, one to the Far Orient, one to the Far Occident, limitless wastes of ice back of her, and her jealous gaze bent southward towards warmer lands and seas, Russia, next to England, is the power to be reckoned with in almost every one of the world's problems. Europe, the Near East, India, China, and the Pacific, each holds a question that must be answered to Russia.

In her interior situation Russia suffers from over-centralisation. Her root-ills derive from the efforts of her rulers from the time of Peter the Great to the present day to imitate the institutions of the West, which they have super-imposed upon the old Russian forms of social fabric, ignoring the basic differences between west-

ern ideas of the aims and methods of organised society, and the Slavonic conception of human relations shown, by their institutions to have been from earliest centuries essentially democratic and co-operative in principle.

In the course of these experiments of imitation Peter was led to abolish the Duma, that old Russian Parliamentary institution. Katharina II., under the influence of Voltaire and the French Encyclopedists, undertook to import reforms from Paris and incidentally, accidentally, as it were, she created that greatest scourge of Russia, serfdom, and a new form of land agglomeration into nobiliary estates.

In 1861 Alexander II. partially repaired Katharina's mistakes by abolishing serfdom, but the land questions created by Peter and Katharina were not thoroughly reached by Alexander's acts and remained half solved. In his creations of the elective provincial, district, and community assemblies, the Zemstvos — which are local

self-governing bodies, he moved in the direction of Slavonic ideal, and those measures were the attempted reformulation of conceptions that had existed in Russia before the time of Peter the Great and had been common to all Slavonic peoples.

The present form of Duma in usurping domains of legislative authority which by right of common sense should, in vast stretches of territories covering such differences of climateric and economic conditions, belong to the local self-governing bodies, is but a new expression of the plague of over-centralisation. The Zemstvo, logically, should possess the same measures of legislative power as that vested in the State Legislatures of the United States.

Russia is, therefore to-day, yet in a state of interior re-construction in which distribution of authority and the many phases of the land question are the important issues.

Russia is chiefly agricultural with a population of one hundred and sixty-four mil-

lions increasing at the rate of two and a half million per annum. Climatic and physical conditions divide that great Empire into three main zones: — the Tundra or vast frozen North, the cold forest zone stretching from the shores of the Baltic in Europe across Siberia to the Pacific Ocean, and the third belt, the Steppas, the agricultural zone.

The drift of Russian population is southward in quest of better land and less severe climateric conditions. Twenty-five years hence the population of Russia, of which seventy-five per cent. are Slavs, will amount to nearly two hundred and fifty millions. Her emigration of Russian race of about one hundred and twenty thousand yearly is mostly composed of agriculturalists in search of good lands. This number has been diminishing since the government has made efforts to relieve the over-crowding of the European districts by aiding settlers to reach the southern and eastern Asian parts of the Empire.

Since the shaking off of the Mongols and the "gathering together of the Russian earth," Russia, station by station has set her landmarks further and further forward into the Asiatic continent. Wild vastnesses, the birthplace of the warring and terror-striking Tartars, have area by area, been subjugated or fallen in as if magnetically drawn under Russian sway, and so opened to civilisation. Russian authority brought with it steadily developing conditions of peace and order to the advantage of Asia and the world. Uniformity of administration and law and the spread of a common tongue tend constantly to confirm these conquests and consolidate them with European Russia, into one close community of speech, sentiment, religion and political interests.

England and the western nations continue to extend their territorial possessions in quest of new markets and trade expansion, those possessions remaining hitherto "colonial" in character. Not so with

Russia, where the imperative demand for increase of territory arising from the growth of population is provided for by forces of conquest dwelling ever at the borders composed of fighters, who at the same time are pioneers and agriculturalists — the Cossack, soldier-colonist, who tills the land as he takes it, and is followed by other Russian settlers, whom he leaves in his place as he penetrates further abreast. Thus the sod itself becomes Russian.[1]

[1] The spirit which inspires the Cossack of to-day in his ceaseless carrying forward of the Russian borders is the same as that which fired the endeavours of Yermak, the peasant "the tracker and pirate of the Volga" and the founder of greater Russia, who writing to the Tzar asking pardon for his lawless past, offered in atonement the vast Asiatic Empire, which he had won with his sword. The highest honors with rank of Prince bestowed upon him with a gift of the Tzar's own mantle by Ivan the Terrible were only picturesque recognitions of his imperishable fame.

The same spirit led Khabaroff, another of Russia's peasant empire-builders, also a winner of lasting national renown, the first Cossack to meet and defeat the Chinese on Chinese soil. There where to-day stands the Capital of Far-Eastern Russia, the town of Khabaroffsk on the Amour River, Khabaroff with but 200 Cossacks won victory over a Chinese army ten-

General Considerations

Most of Russia's soil is in the cold zone and not suited for good farming, so her necessity to acquire land sparsely populated in temperate and warm zones; therefore Russia has no interest in the conquest or annexation of densely populated countries, and it is not likely that India or China are in any danger of Russian invasion. The case is different in regard to

fold stronger than his own. In his letter written to the Tzar almost in sight of the Pacific Ocean fifty years after Yermak had crossed the Ural mountains, he manifests the Russian idea:—

"— On March 24th at day-break, the Bogdoi (Chinese) army, horsemen and armoured men came upon us Cossacks . . . we Cossacks put on our armour, and I, Ierothei, and the regular and volunteer Cossacks, praying the Saviour and our Blessed Virgin and Saint Nicholas took farewell of each other. And I, Ierothei, and Andrea Ivanoff, and all our Cossack army said:— 'Let us die, brother Cossacks, for the Christian Faith, let us stand by the Saviour, the Virgin and Saint Nicholas, let us serve the Emperor Alexis Michailovich, Grand Prince of All the Russias, and let us Cossacks all die against the Tzar's enemies, but never shall we fall alive into the hands of the Bogdoi men' . . . As we sallied forth upon them we captured two iron guns, and by the Grace of God and the Imperial good luck and our own efforts we fell upon the enemy

Eastern Turkestan or Mongolia which are both practically empty. Manchuria was virtually unpopulated at the time of the Russian occupation, and the same was true of western Turkestan.

Russian needs are lands sparsely populated in temperate and warm zones, and the open warm Sea.

JAPAN, like Great Britain, an island State, the latest comer among the great

. . . and a great fear came upon them . . . and the remaining Bogdoi men (Chinese) fled from the town and our arms." . . .

Many writers who have travelled through those far regions always have found as answer to their questions whether from peasant, simple private soldier, Cossack, or official high or low the same notion of Russian mission along the top of the world: — to carry the Cross forward and with it peace and order. The Christian ideal as expressed in the Russian Orthodox Faith, deeply embedded in the Slavonic heart, peasant and prince alike, has its chief characteristics in conceptions of brother-hood finding practical expression in communistic institutions and customs, looking toward the definite establishment of Christ's Kingdom on the Earth. So the wildest Cossack leader takes with him the Cross, and plants it as a standard to mark his road of conquest.

modern powers, is one of the oldest of state-formations, maintained through the centuries on the basis of a strong military feudalism and closed to the world.

In 1854 that island nation was compelled by the United States in the person of Commodore Perry to open its doors, an operation at once put to advantage by other nations following in the wake of America. Japan, brought thus suddenly face to face with the Occident, realised that in self-defence, and in order to preserve her power of self-assertion in a different world ruled by different conditions from any she had known, the Japanese must make themselves able to meet the West with weapons of the West. In the period of turmoil and upheaval that ensued the late Emperor Mutso-Hito, as a youth, put himself at the head of the new movements effecting the imperial restoration to power, and gradually brought about those changes in the organisation of all departments of military, political, economic

and cultural existence, which re-incarnated the old Japanese martial spirit in modern forms, creating within that Emperor's single life a new Japan possessing power more formidable than had ever been attained during the previous thousands of years of Japanese history.

The northern regions of the Japanese Isles, Saghalin, Yeso and the northern part of Nippon are cold, forest-covered and thinly populated. The warm southern parts of the Islands are its agricultural districts, lands of the rice-fields, the tea-plantation, the home of the cherry-blossoms and the picturesque scenes with Fujiyama in the background made known by the native artists and which image Japan in the world's mind.

Three-fifths of the agricultural land is composed of small farms tilled by their owners, the other two-fifths are worked on the tenant system. The warm parts of the country are over-populated. Hence, with abundance of cheap labour Japan has

been able to triumphantly enter the field of modern industries, and the scientific exploitation of her mineral resources. The industries, however, do not absorb the whole of the dense over-population, large numbers of which emigrate southward to the warm islands and far shores of the Pacific.

In spite of the skill of the farmer it is significant that Japan has been forced to begin the importation of food-stuffs.

With her growing industries fostered by State subvention and financial participation, under a system which is a new departure in political economy, Japan experiences in common with other nations the increasing necessity for foreign markets. She is on the high road to become one of the foremost carrier-nations and her commercial ports tend more and more to become the great clearing-houses for the Far East.

These conditions and the defence of her islands must shape her future policies, and

they seem to indicate a logical ambition for Japanese supremacy on Pacific Seas.

The UNITED STATES OF AMERICA — the first mighty offspring born of the modern spirit of independence, found its hour and opportunity to come forth into being, in the great Anglo-Franco contests of the eighteenth century. While those powers were locked in the struggle for colonial and naval supremacy in the Far Atlantic, the fledgling prize, like an unwatched callow eagle, suddenly found the strength of its wings and took flight towards the sun — to the wonderment of both combatants and the rest of mankind.

From young America came the first proclamation to the world, in the voice of accomplished fact, of the right of a whole people to choose its form of government as well as name its governors. That new assertion of human rights within the short elapse of time since its utterance by Washington's army and the valorous framers

of the Declaration of Independence, has, as Lafayette prophesied, speaking to French Louis, of the "Red, White and Blue," "gone round the world."

The tale of American growth is a story of marvel. How the original thirteen States, with unheard-of rapidity, leapt westward like prairie flame and stretched themselves into a vast continent filling the earth between the two oceans; first, the refuge of the world's noblest rebels, then, coming to be the goal of armies of the down-trodden, the destitute and the broken-hearted, immigrants from those parts of old Europe where life was most difficult or the heel of oppression the heaviest,— these things are recounted by millions of American school-boys in the accents of all the races of the globe.

Before the new nation, lay the untrammelled exploitation of the limitless treasure of virgin nature in the temperate zone. For a time every man could have land for a home by merely living on it. The pos-

sibilities of the stupendous exploitation of the riches of the sub-soil — the metals and oils — were seized upon by men who became Titans in their handling of immeasurable resources. The wealth they melted together and rolled up grew into whole worlds, too great for human control, incapable of pausing, gathering and crushing into their spheres all things and all lives on their way.

In the development of gigantic industries the vast systems of railroads, and harnessed water and electricity, and even the produce of farm and cattle-ranch, were in a way the progeny of the giant industries, and came more and more to be considered only in their relation to those vast inhuman mechanisms for the building of towers of gold. In the service of the industries the lives of the multitudes of men once more lost their personal meaning, became cheap, valued only according to their measure of capacity to in some way feed the inexorable machine, either with brains

or body, becoming only so much brain, or so much labour. In the cyclopean development the human equation had been well-nigh over-looked, but spilt life, like spilt blood calls, from the ground, and the new race aroused to a sense of its perils, whether as labourers in revolt, or as educated sons and daughters of an ideal, have set themselves with all their might to exact or seek fulfilment of the promise of the Republic as a land where life, liberty and happiness of the individual shall be secure. So in the "brave new world" of freedom men have again brought together all the ferocious passions and miseries as well as all the genius and divine hope and heroism of the human race, raising all its ancient problems to the power of the unknown figure of the new world's incomputable dynamics. There, still, must the old battles be waged and principles of life and death prove themselves, in furnaces of fearful blast, hitherto unseen on the earth.

Meanwhile American commerce has

gone out across all the seas to all countries. Its ports from imperial New York to the Golden Gate at the setting sun are world-ports. And who shall say with the opening of the Panama Canal what will be the power of New Orleans feeding the world's shipping with the drain of America's produce borne by the Mississippi to the Gulf, or what other vast emporia of the sea will rise to commercial greatness in the course of American progression.

With the Spanish war America stepped boldly forward as a great world power who must enter the race for markets, and whose foreign policies must be dictated by the necessities of her economic development.

The national needs of GERMANY have to be considered from a two-fold point of view: — first, in the light of her European position; and second, in relation to her world policies looking to the oceans and over seas.

The borders of Germany are artificial, and the great movement for German unity has not yet attained the full measure of its goal. There are Germans still in Austria, and there is a Teutonic speaking race about the mouth of the German Rhine and the Shelde, lands once within the great German Kingdom of the Middle Ages. Prior to the war of 1866 which fixed the destiny of modern Germany, there existed the alternative of a re-constructed Germany led by Hapsburg-Austria, and a smaller but more powerful German Empire more purely national, to be built by Prussia and the Hohenzollerns. Fate and the genius of Bismark seconded by Moltke leading a galaxy of remarkable German patriots, cast the die for the Hohenzollern creation, which is the nucleus of the greater Germany of to-morrow.

The soil in Germany is not generally very favourable to agriculture, but skill and patience of the farmer make the best of it. The produce, however, is no longer

sufficient to feed the fast augmenting population, and the importation of food-stuffs has already become a necessity. Up to the early eighties the German emigration ran as high as two hundred thousand a year. The German industries were not yet developed and the surplus population which could not find profitable employ in agriculture and its allied branches emigrated. With the development of the industries and German mercantile shipping, acting not only as carrier of German produce, but slowly becoming the carrier of the larger trade of the world, that surplus population found employment at home and the emigration ceased. The different legislations caring for the worker, such as the workmen's insurance laws, and other measures in protection of the labouring classes, coupled with the workmen-schools, developed highly skilled labour, so that today Germany has an immigration of unskilled labour compensating largely for the small yearly emigration of about twenty-five

thousand, a figure stationary during the last ten years, and small, considering the increase in Germany's population from about forty millions in 1870 to about sixty-seven million in 1912.

The sub-soil in the central regions of the Empire holds vast mineral deposits. The enormous coal beds and water-power have enabled Germany to virtually stop the tide of emigration and engage in stupendous industrial development aided by great State-owned systems of railroads and waterways. The ever-increasing waterway system is formed of the rivers and their vast network of inter-connecting navigable canals, which put all parts of Germany into inter-communication by water and rail.

Starting at Hamburg and Bremen the German merchant marine bears a great part of the imperial commerce which is second only to that of Great Britain.

With the necessity in the near future of finding territory for an overflow of popu-

lation, Germany entered the race for colonies, but so late in the day that the best of the lands still open to colonisation had already been occupied or pre-empted by the other great powers. Only Cameroun on the west Coast of Africa and German East Africa can be said to have become responsive as colonies.

Germany's needs are: control of a larger extent of home sea coast, colonies better suited for German population than those she at present possesses; and for the protection of her commercial expansion in the interests of markets which have been scientifically created and fostered in all regions of the earth she requires a powerful military fleet and naval stations.

In the eighteenth century FRANCE and England fought on the seas for colonial empire and naval supremacy. After France had lost the Indies the contest was carried to the Americas where France supporting the American revolution, saw de-

feat inflicted on England. England's retort was to aid the revolution in France, carrying the battle to the very throne in the palace of Versailles, and into the shadow of the Guillotine on the Place de la Grève. France seemed to have slid down a path of blood to utter ruin. Foreign armies, strengthened with subsidies from the adversary, were already on the march to take part in the spoils of fallen empire. But in that hour of utter disarray and darkness, the soul of France awakened, the nation found leaders to assert the will of a living people, and with Napoleon, put a ring of fire around the nation to stand forever as a token of French valour and military glory.

Like a god, fashioning new worlds out of the shattered rack of starry systems after a celestial cataclysm, Napoleon drew material from the general wreckage from which he modelled institutions of national credit, of law and justice, of administrative function, of learning, art and religion,

and organisation in all departments of public life, which have enabled France to withstand, through various vicissitudes, the assaults of a century from within and without.

The soil is good for agriculture, the subsoil only rich in minerals in the east and north, the regions of the industries. France, with no over-population, is chiefly agricultural in the proportion of three-fifths to two-fifths. The land in general is owned by large numbers of petty agriculturers who till the soil carefully and frugally hoard their earnings. The farmer is the back-bone of France and the "wool-stocking" holding his savings makes of France the banker of nations.

Although France possesses a long coast line she is poor in good commercial sand-free ports, but rich in a fine net-work of interior water-ways of rivers and canals making connection with the sea-ports and with the Rhine on the north. Industrial France in the east and north, removed from any

convenient sea-outlet, has brought a gravitation of French interests toward the Rhine and the ports at its mouth. The thousand-year old political question of the Rhine, Alsace-Lorraine, apart from all popular sentiment in both France and Germany, has always been at bottom a question of economics.

In nearly all the countries of the world the necessity of obtaining colonies has near relation to over-population, either immediate or imminent in the home-lands; but in France, colonial possessions, beyond their value as markets, assert the majesty of France's position among the great powers, and the ideal of cultural and intellectual dominance which is never absent from the French mind.

With the Restauration in 1815 the aim of French policy was to undo the work of the Congress of Vienna, and to regain France's lost prestige by colonial expansion. The last gift of the Bourbons to France before their final exit, was Algiers,

— a new France across the Mediterranean.

After the French disaster of 1870-71, in addition to the effort at re-assertion of national might through colonial expansion, France's policy was influenced by the necessities of her national defence having regard to Germany and Italy, and the sentimental desire to retake what were considered her "natural borders" on the Rhine.

ITALY through the centuries had been a mere geographical expression and the name of a dream of unification, floating in the mind of its poets and statesmen who more than once vaguely attempted its realisation, noteworthily by a great Roman Pope. The vision was brought ephemerally into substance by the protean hand of Napoleon,— but only made real, by the famous group of men in whose van were, that weaver of dreams into woof, Mazzini, Garibaldi, leader of swords, blazing a new way, and Cavour, the brain, in whose fine

flame were brought together into formulated creation all that could be wrought by the others.

Massimo d'Azeglio said at the first convening of the young Italian Parliament: — "Italy is made, we have now to make the Italians," and the war just concluded with Turkey to win back the old Roman possession of Tripoli has been the completing stroke in the making of Italians.

At the moment of Italy's unification, economic conditions in the several regions were unequal and belonged to differing periods of time. In the north, were conditions favourable for development. In the centre and south, the country lay under mediæval disabilities. Italy still suffers under the heritage of the disorganisation and corruption of the centuries when her lands were the prey of foreign misrule and rapine.

She is only at the beginning of the exploitation of her rich natural resources. Her great problem is still the agrarian

question. In the south, the land is devoured by the latifundia which ruined Rome in antiquity. Some districts are almost empty of inhabitants, while the towns are overcrowded, causing a large emigration of misery-stricken people. The northern parts of Italy with large numbers of small agricultural owners and tenant farmers are prosperous.

The Peninsula is not very rich in minerals, but the lack of coal has been overcome by the use of water-power and electricity which is making of northern Italy an industrial region of importance.

In the Middle Ages the Italian Republics of Venice, Genoa, and Florence were the rich emporia of Europe's trade with the Orient, and at the present time the geographical position of Italy gives her a commanding position in the commerce between East and West. Naples has become prominent as a commercial port and Genoa is again rising towards her ancient maritime splendour.

New Italy has not only had to re-erect and set in order a house crumbling to decay, but the newly organised State had to face a difficult political situation, enemies within its borders, the constant necessity of guarding against attack from Austria and the clash of her interests in the Mediterranean with those of France.

The recent Italian conquest of Tripoli in the war with Turkey was aimed not only at stemming the tide of Italian emigration which was draining the nation's life-blood, but at acquiring a coast line on opposite African shores, with islands in the Mediterranean of strategic value in the interests of her national defence against Austrian aggression southward, and the assertion of the power of Italy in the Mediterranean.

In antiquity as we know, the problems of the intercourse of nations, their political, economical and cultural life centred chiefly around the Mediterranean, the Red Sea

and the Persian Gulf, and remained so through the ages, up to the time when the land roads of commerce between East and West were thronged and closed by the invading Turks. At that time there was no Suez Canal, no known sea-road from Europe to the East. The entire trade in the Eastern Mediterranean, the vast traffic along the land roads across Syria and Arabia was in the hands of Venice.

The search for new roads along which to bring the silks, gems and spices of the Orient westward, opened up, in the discovery of the Americas and rounding of the Cape, new sea-routes to India and China and the Pacific Isles, and gave rise to the contest among European nations for colonial possessions, new lands, new markets. Spain, Portugal, France, Holland and England all strove for the monopoly of the newly discovered sea-roads, each seeking to become the sole possessor of those rich markets, those new lands with

their unlimited wealth, made accessible for the first time by the new sea tracks.

Those were the times of the noble company of sea-adventurers, the Spanish Main, and Buccaneers, of the South Sea bubbles and of Chartered Companies.

Those new fields of commercial and economic battle displaced the ancient centre of world interest from the Mediterranean to the Gulf of Mexico, the Americas and India. The sanguinary struggles among the nations of Europe for commercial, economic and colonial supremacy took place on the oceans of the world as well as on the blood-stained fields of Europe. The battle of centuries between England and France came to a culmination and finish with the French revolution and the ensuing wars. Pitt, who had so largely financed the French revolution, said on the eve of the battle of Austerlitz (1805), where he confidently hoped that Napoleon would be crushed by the Austro-Russian Allies, that

on that battle-field England would regain her lost American colonies.

In 1798, Napoleon, then General Bonaparte, received the order to occupy Egypt for France, and to cut a canal across the Isthmus of Suez, so to execute the plan which had first been conceived by Venice in 1505, and later revived by the Philosopher Leibnitz and proposed by him to Louis XIV. of France. Bonaparte was to make of Egypt and the Red Sea a base of operations for the re-conquest of India from England. Napoleon's Egyptian campaign proving barren of result, inspired in that homeric brain the policy of launching Russia across the vastnesses of Asia towards British India. To that end was formed the ephemeral alliance between Napoleon and the Emperor Paul of Russia, and since then, without surcease, Moscow has haunted London.

At the close of the Napoleonic era, after the congress of Vienna, England was the mistress of the seas, having won, during

the Napoleonic wars not only the complete mastership of India, but Dutch South Africa, the great island positions in the Mediterranean of Malta and the Ionian Isles. Her eyes were thenceforth bent upon Egypt and Suez, Persia and Afghanistan, seeing in those regions the advance posts of her defence of India. Every move of Russian expansion in Asia or in Europe appeared to the statesmen of Great Britain as a step in the great Napoleonic plan of a Russian conquest of India. From that time up to the present day the "ORIENT QUESTION"— centred in the Eastern Mediterranean, the Balkans (Bosphorus and Dardanelles), Suez, Egypt, Persia and the approaches to India, — has been the titanic contest between the Colossus of the North and the Conqueror of India, modified in its various phases by the issues proceeding from the Hapsburg desire for the subjugation of the Balkan lands, the efforts of France in the earlier years of the century to destroy the work

of the Vienna Congress and later to avenge the disaster of 1870-71, and the appearance of a new and formidable antagonist to England with the entrance of Germany into the World Arena, creating the ANGLO-GERMAN SITUATION, in essence an increasing trade rivalry between those nations each backed by augmenting militant forces.

The Hapsburg plans for the conquest of neighbouring sovereign States and the struggle of that Dynasty with the spirit of nationality in the effort to hold down various annexed provinces belonging to several racial groups, constituting a battle to the death on one of its last fields between worn-out feudal tyranny and the modern demand for national freedom, are the elements of this stupendous PROBLEM whose solution in the near future has already been signalled by the present acts of international aggression on the part of AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

The antagonism between England and

Russia, the re-generation of Japan and consequent necessity of expansion in all departments of its national life, the final awakening of China, the Japanese victories over Russia resulting in the Russo-Japanese alliance full of grave concern to the world situation, brought forth that latest and most stupendous of modern aspects of the Orient Question: the MASTERY of the FAR EAST and the PACIFIC.

The fast-evolving imperial policies of America, her particular interests in her own hemisphere asserted by the Monroe Doctrine, and the problematic nature of the future attitude which other nations may come to assume towards that assertion, together with the character of the means of making foreign protest effective, form the elements of the AMERICAN PROBLEM into which with the opening of the Canal and the development of the new situation in the Pacific, the conflicts between the other Great Nations must be reflected either intimately or remotely.

CHAPTER II

THE NEAR EASTERN PROBLEM

A. GENERAL SURVEY.

THAT part of the world geographically limited by the Eastern Mediterranean, the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf, the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea, was always the point of contact between the Occident and Orient. For thousands of years it was the arena of the nations in the thrall of empire-building. There, ancient dominions rose upon ruins of former States, to be themselves in time subject to the same fate at the hand of invaders, ever pouring in from the world's womb. New realms and sways, ever forming, failing and reforming, like the changing surface of the sea, unceasingly rising and falling either, in semblance of rhythm, or lashing in tem-

pestuous fury, lifting up unconquerable mountains of murderous tides towards the skies, not to be stayed or withstood till its rage be self-spent. So, again and again, sword and flame in those mid-regions of the earth, swept out of existence the beginnings of nascent civilisations before they could fully bring forth any lasting treasure of culture or any social organism able to resist the rack of time and insure steady progress to the race of men.

When, with the Turkish conquests, the Mediterranean and its coasts became the scenes of the exploits of the pirates and corsairs of Islam, and the sea-faring exploits of Portuguese and Spaniards had caused the waters of the broad oceans to become the highway to India and the mysterious lands of the Orient, and new continents were discovered, this centre of world interests for several hundred years, lost its predominance as the region of encounter between the nations of the world, and became relegated to a more secondary

plane. During the last century, immediately following the Napoleonic period of wars, when the making of the British Empire neared its completion and the Russian began to reach out further over the Asiatic Continent, Mediterrania acquired again its old prominence. With the piercing of the Suez Canal, and the orientation anew of commerce along the old trade-routes from Europe to Asia through the Eastern Mediterranean and the Red Sea, and with the building of railroads across Asia Minor, pushing their steel lines in the direction of India, the economic and political interests and ambitions of the European nations converged once again in that region of the earth. So every change in the balance of power among European nations is reflected in that quarter, and every move or change in that region reacts on the political conditions of Europe. With the development of the Far-Eastern situation and the Pacific Question, which in their turn touch closely the American problem, the Near

Eastern Question, so long called the Orient Question, has come into inter-relation with those problems of the Far East and the Pacific, and changes in either hemisphere must thenceforth affect the general situation.

The study of this problem requires consideration of its historic elements in order to observe how they shaped themselves into their present phase, not only concerning local aspects and the principles they are based upon, but as they affect the chessboard of European and world politics.

The two main formative forces at the foundation of the situation as it is to-day, are two mighty groups of conquests: — one, the attainment of Islam,— Arab and Ottoman Turk; — the other, the colonial achievements and expansion in Asia of the European powers.

The Turkish conquest created all those questions of primarily local impor-

tance. Their international bearings arise from the political changes they occasion or might occasion causing them to be reflected in the political conditions of the world. Those questions involve — the difference of creed and civilisation between conqueror and conquered; the impossibility of amalgamation between conqueror and conquered into a nation; his necessity of holding the conquered lands and peoples by repression and force; the resistance of the nations who at one time or other had been conquered by the Ottoman and their strife to recall from abeyance their inherent national sovereignty, which the conquest had made dormant. The Balkan Question at this moment appears to be nearing a solution — which eliminates the Ottoman element, but yet fails to completely wipe out the consequences both direct and indirect of the Osmanli conquest, as questions are still pending, intimately connected with the problems which the Austro-Hungarian State formation present.

The probable and final solution of that European problem must include the re-adjustment of the balance of power in Europe, making place for the new State-group, the Allied States of the Balkans, in league concerning common foreign interests and representing a great militant power.

Among the considerations within the old realm of Ottoman conquest, which, after hundreds of years at last claim practical attention and solution, are the re-assertion — probably in the near future, of the Armenian nation and its sovereignty at present in abeyance to the Turk, Home-rule for the Arabs of Syria and Yemen, and the re-organisation of the Ottoman Empire itself in Asia — if indeed there still be an Ottoman Empire.

The other principal formative forces of that Near Eastern Question were generated by the conquests and expansion of European powers in Asia, and comprises all the different questions resulting from the encounter of the Russian Empire still in

making and the British Empire in the process of consolidation and conservation, which found their theatre in the Ottoman Empire, in Persia, and in China, where Japan entered as one mighty factor, and the United States as another. In the Near Eastern or Ottoman part of that theatre, France, at the beginning was a shaping element, as to-day is Germany, a newcomer not to be neglected, especially in view of her militant power and the Anglo-German situation; and, too, Italy in acquiring Tripoli has gained a more commanding voice in the Arena of Nation-makers and Empire-builders.

B. ISLÂM.

First, among the events which brought about the changes in the distribution of political power among the nations of the earth, an event among the most important at the basis of the problems now before the world, was the coming of Islâm.

Islâm as a religious faith, a cultural

force, a status of society, or a civilisation is based on other mental conceptions than those of Greece and Rome or of Brahma, Buddha, Confucius, Zoroaster or Mithra. Islâmic teaching, as shown in its restrictions and its rewards, was pre-eminently fitted to accomplish the sole aim of conquest by the sword, to create fighting material, soldiers; the assertion of the sacredness of the Islâmic war of conquest. War waged by the Mahomedan was always "Holy war," etc., and it is not by accident that the one creative achievement of Mahomedanism through the ages was irresistible hosts of conquest — brought to their extremest pitch of effectiveness and fanaticism in the Janisaries of the Ottomans.

Mahomedanism, so-called after its prophet and founder Mahomet, is not a religion in the Christian sense, involving principally problems of morality, spiritual growth and immortality, but somewhat similar to Mosaism, a social status, regulating all actions of civil life and social relation-

ship. That social, political and religious fabric called Islâm, is based on the legal principles, the mystical, ethical and philosophical tenets as revealed to Mahomet and set down in the *"Khourân";* secondly, the acts, decisions and opinions, the life of Mahomet, called *"Sunna,"* contained in the recorded traditions *"al Hadith"* of his companions and helpers; and thirdly, the legislative efforts of the first three generations of believers after Mahomet, by unanimous consent *"Idjmâ"*— fixed into an immutable legal and social system *"Figh* or *Cheri'a"* by the Masters (*Imâm,* or *Mudjtahidoûn*) of the four schools of orthodox Mahomedan teaching in the second century after the Prophet, closing all legislative effort from that time forth, except that accomplished by analogy *"Khiyas,"* a process whereby any new measure must prove its legal justification by its analogy with one or another of the laws found in the other three main sources of Mahomedan legislation: the Khourân,

Sunna, and Idjmâ, analogy *"Khiyas"* being the fourth main source. The lawyers and judges of Islâm are its priests, and the head of this judicial hierarchy was first called *"Imâm,"* then *"Khazi-ul-Khouzat"* and at present *"Sheikh-ul-Islâm."* The *"Khalifa,"* successor of the Prophet, "Commander of the Faithful" (*"Emir-al-Mu'menin"*) is the "executive head" the "administrator" of Islâm, which is the Islâmic State, whose limits are not territorial but which includes the vast body of believers throughout all the lands of the world.

The Khalifa, the recognised successor of Mahomet, is only the administrator of Islâm, the highest executive officer of a system assumed to be fixed and definitive. His duties are, to enforce the laws, and maintain in their entirety and integrity the doctrines of Islâm, to keep and defend the possession of all lands which have ever fallen under the sword of Islâm. He has no right under any circumstances to cede

any of such lands or to acknowledge that any lands can ever be reconquered from Islâm. In case nations rise up and throw off the Moslem yoke, the Khalifa is still bound to assert Islâmic sovereignty by fiction and to impose where possible the symbol of that persistency by obtaining that a mosque shall remain forever in the lost lands where, every Friday, the Khalifa is to be named in prayers.[1]

The Khalifa is deposed by "*fetva*" if it can be proved that he has violated an essential doctrine of Islâm.

For centuries the office of "Khalifa" was in the hands of the descendants of

[1] When Hungary after a submission of a hundred and fifty years was finally freed from the Turk by the treaty of Karlovitz it was stipulated that the Hungarians would always preserve the tomb and small memorial mosque at Buda-Pest of a holy moslem, Gul-Baba (Father of Roses) and to this day the Hungarian Government keeps up this small mosque where the name of the Turkish Sultan and Khalifa is included in prayer offerings. The same concessions have been allowed to the out-going Turk in Servia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Greece and other countries which were able to make themselves free of the Moslem.

Mahomet and orthodox Moslem even to-day contest the right of any person not so descended to assume that power as the political, religious and social chief-administrative head of Islâm. The Arabs are now at variance with the Ottoman Sultans who, since Selim, 1517, have arrogated to themselves the title of Khalifa, as conquerors and possessors of the Holy places of Mecca and Medina, in virtue of a transference to themselves in that year of the right by the last Abbasid Khalifa, who was the legitimate successor of the Prophet. That cession was legalised by a "*fetva*" (formula) issued the same year by the Sheikh of Mecca. Since then in spite of the traditional requirement that a Khalifa must be of the blood of Khoreish, the Sultans of Turkey have worn the title of "*Khalifa*" and "Commander of the faithful." At that time the Green Flag of the Prophet, the "*Bariak-al-Sherîf*," with the Mantle and the sealing-ring of the Prophet were carried from Mecca to

Constantinople, where they have remained to the present time, the sacred symbols of Islâm throughout all the regions of the earth wherever there are Mahomedans.

Under Mahomet and his immediate successors, the conquering Arab hordes streamed westward and eastward in two armies, one, across Africa to Spain and France, the other, towards Constantinople and eastward to India. With one vast sweep was created the mighty Saracenic Empire, held together by the sole force of the flame of conquest. Once those whirlwinds past and spent, their fires burnt out, that empire became dismembered with the same rapidity, and there was a falling back of the various peoples into the temper of their usual existence. But the impulse, tremendous if momentary, had been sufficient to leave after it that structure, which is Islâm, and to stimulate into action a large intellectual movement rousing to remembrance the intellectual capacities of peoples, the fragments of na-

tions who had in the past been the recipients of the culture of Hellas, Rome and Persia. The Berber, in Spain and northern Africa, the Persian, the Greco-Syriac, in Asia and Egypt and at the court of the Khalifas at Bagdad, revived the traditions of the classical period which made of Bagdad, Cairo, Khairowan, Tlemcen, Cordova and Sevilla, centres of culture and learning. Based on ancient wisdom and Greek and Roman classics, that impulse resembled somewhat both in origin and inspiration phases of the later Italian re-birth of learning and art, and though abortive and short-lived in comparison, it served the purpose of preserving for the later Italian development many Greek and other precious works of the golden period of antiquity which in Arabic translation, fed the well-springs of the Renaissance.

With the coming of the Ottoman Turk the cultural life which had received a stimulus in a new direction by the Arab conquests was extinguished, Persia, that old

home of Asiatic culture and civilisation, was laid to waste. In Syria, Asia Minor, and Egypt the cultural impulse ceased. The old saying is, "where the Turk has trod no grass grows."

The Ottoman Turk spread the conquests of Islâm into Europe, entering the Balkan Peninsula, and so was laid the basis of the modern Near Eastern Question.

It has been a subject of wonder that the Turks never formed together with the races which they conquered an Ottoman nation, nor even a Turkish civilisation. Their presence proving even destructive of the civilisations which they found in the lands which they subdued with the sword. In England the various successive invaders, Saxons, Danes, Normans, etc., became assimilated throughout the centuries with the inhabitants forming a single people, enriched by the ideas of each and all, with common culture and common national life. The same has been true in some degree of all other western nations.

But no such assimilation ever occurred or could take place between the Turkish Mahomedan conquerors and the non-Moslem conquered. It was barred by the essential basic principles of the Islâmic system. The definite setting apart of conqueror and conquered was fixed first by the saying of Mahomet: —"*Outrouku heum va ma yedinouney*"—"Let each stay where he belongs" and by the organic statute of Mahomedan government expressed by Khalifa Omar, in the time of "*Idjmâ*," making the Moslem to remain the superior and dominating class — the perpetual soldier of occupation, whose support had to be furnished by the conquered people. All assimilation with peoples of other creed was impossible, but whoever renounced his faith to become a Moslem was thereby instantly naturalised into Islâm receiving the status and all life-chances of a born Moslem or Osmanli. The impossibility of the fusion of races held under a Moslem conqueror with their Mahomedan lords was

strikingly illustrated in the confession of that Sultan in the Seventeenth Century who urged that as Moslem victor and Christian vanquished could never make one people, Ottoman domination could only become secure by the universal slaughter of all Christians in conquered territory. Up to our own time that conclusion has haunted Stamboul like an evil dream, whether in the palaces of the Sultan and Khalifa, or in the Committee of Progress and Union.

There is in Islâm a tenet called the law of Constraint (*"Ikhrâh"*) the practical effect of which is to justify any action of the Mahomedan individual or community performed under coercion. The same law exacts that the instant the pressure of coercion is relieved the true Moslem must revert to the conduct prescribed in Islâm. This process explains why it was that Europe never obtained anything from Turkey except by coercion, and could never secure any permanent results, as what was gained disappeared in-

stantly upon the withdrawal of the coercive measures. The frequent massacres in olden and modern times, the Bulgarian atrocities, the Armenian massacres, the recent massacres of Adana, the Macedonian tortures and outrages attest to the principle of wholesale slaughter as a political means of Moslem government and discipline, justified in Islâm by the law of Constraint. The Moslem in his turn does not expect any other treatment from his Christian rulers. This tenet obtains in the English tenure in Egypt and the Moslem parts of India, France's tenure in Algeria, Tunis, and Morocco, Italy's presence in Tripoli and the rule of Russia over her Moslem subjects. The nature of this law was illustrated by the question asked and answer given in 1862 when the French government having subdued Algeria, obtained from the Sheikhs of Mecca a "*fetva*" permitting Algerian Moslems to accept the French rule.

In Turkey, the Christian and Hebrew

communities were formed under their several religious heads into nations, "*Milets*" virtually considered alien, subordinated to the Moslems. The mere fact of being a Moslem gave to the individual the right of authority over all non-Moslems in all circumstances. All the affairs of personal status among non-Moslems were regulated by their own Church hierarchy: marriage, death, inheritance, litigations among themselves, etc., but all which depended upon the *status realis* was ruled by the *Cheri,* the Mahomedan sacred law. They possessed real estate property only by tolerance. Among the taxes which they had to pay was one called "the tax giving them permission to walk on the Sultan's land" i. e. "Islâm's land." They formed a State within a State, tolerated, but without rights, without redress for any act committed against them by any citizen of Islâm and having only duties and obligations to perform.

Under such a system based, in regard to

all non-Moslems, upon the dogma of inequality before the law, it is easy to see that a modern constitution, with equality before the law, equal rights of citizens, etc., and all other fundamental principles of a modern State-formation, can only remain a dead-letter. The two principles, one the fundamental basis of the Ottoman State or any other Moslem State, a principle embodied in their faith, recognising only Moslems as citizens,— the other, a fundamental principle of the modern constitutional State, guaranteeing equality to all men, are in diametrical opposition to each other. Experience has shown the truth of this in the recent experiment of the Ottoman constitution, which perforce became a farce, a game of confidence played upon a too credulous Western world, with the object of eluding foreign pressure for the cessation of conditions of chronic anarchy in Turkey and internal reforms to make tolerable the existence of the non-Moslem population. The savage methods em-

ployed by the Young Turks after the proclamation of the Turkish constitution and the inauguration of the rule of the Committee of Progress and Union, were in keeping with the Moslem principle — and showed that the well-considered words of the constitution were only cynical means of placating Europe not meant to be taken seriously or literally by the Christians. The methods "of discipline" employed, savage and wholesale, the reports of which filled the columns of the *London Times*, were only the ordinary means of the Ottoman government to impress the Christians with the realisation that their status had not changed by the Constitution, that they were still the rayah, the rightless, tolerated mass, and the Moslem, still the over-lord and master.

Even in purely Mahomedan countries, like Persia, any attempt at a constitutional form of government must break down, although there may be no problem of subject races, by reason of the inflexibility of

the system irrevocably fixed so many centuries ago in the midst of conditions differing radically from those of the modern world and not admitting of amendment or extension except by means of the legislative effort determined by analogy (*khiyas*). How can a Parliament express the will of a people if that people's will be bound in advance? A Moslem ruler, however despotic he may be, is himself bound to observe the absolute prescriptions of that sacred law, whose expounder-in-chief, today called the Sheikh-ul-Islâm, assisted by his "learned" Ulemas, keeps vigilant watch over the edicts of that law and whose opinion expressed in a formula called "*fetva*," the ruler is obliged to follow under the penalty of being deposed as an "unbeliever."

Mahomet, the Prophet, consulted certain of his companions upon all matters which were not especially revealed to him, and in regard to the application of the Heavenly order which he received by revelation.

That precedent then established has ruled ever since in Islâm. Ahmed Rifaât in the Encyclopedia of Islâm cites the following case: —" Khalifa Al-Mansour, the second Abbasid Khalifa, planned a military expedition against the town of Mossoul. Before setting out, he called together the jurisconsults " as the law required;" and demanded from them the formula, which should authorise him to undertake that campaign. His reasons were found to be nul (*batil*). The "*fetva*" was rendered consequently in the negative, the Khalifa submitted to the verdict and the expedition was abandoned. Which distinctly proves that even the first Khalifas were chained by doctrinal advice. The "*fetva*" is the doctrinal advice given by the jurisconsults and corresponds somewhat to the formula of the Roman Prætor. The Arabic word "*fetva*" existed long before the time of Mahomet and was a legal term signifying the answer to a question on a point of law, given by a legal authority. The

words of the *Khourân* establishing the form of the *fetva* begins: —" *Yesteftouney kay"* (they ask you an advice) *" Gool Illahou youftikoun fill"* (say to them God has given an advice on . . .).

A parliament expressing the will of the people in constitutional States, whether republics or monarchies can create a law and pass it, and have it enacted and executed even against the will of the Chief-executive, by certain means provided for in that constitution. Such a course would be entirely out of question in a Mahomedan country. A Moslem parliament could *à la rigeur,* act without the approval of the Moslem sovereign, but its enactments would be illegal and worthless, unable to be enforced without the *" fetva"* or sanction of the *" Sheikh-ul-Islâm."* The explanation of that situation is: that the period of *" idjmâ"* or direct legislative effort by universal consent, having been closed since the second century after Mahomet, no legislation by a parliament

could be accomplished by any other means than that of the "legislative effort" denominated "analogy" (*khiyas*), it lies with the Sheikh-ul-Islâm to pronounce upon such enactments as to whether or not they satisfy the demands of analogy and therefore prove their basis in Islâm. The "*fetva*" of the Sheikh-ul-Islâm must be accepted by all Moslems under the penalty of excommunication.

The spectacle in Turkey and Persia furnishes only too ample proofs of the impotence of parliamentary legislation in Moslem lands. It is hardly necessary to recall the vain attempts at reform in Turkey, Persia, Morocco and other lands of Islâm, and the incapacity of those States to create a well-ordered government with conditions of security for life and property able to develop on lines of modern progress and civilisation. Wherever Islâmic conquests found higher civilisations, it stunted them or ruined their further progress. Prince Malcom Khan, for nearly forty

years Persian Minister Plenipotentiary in Europe, a Persian patriot, and a man of great learning and European culture, said that Mahomedanism has wrecked Persia and brought that country to utter ruin. He said that: "that as the forgotten cities of ancient Persia had been overwhelmed and covered from sight by the drifting desert sands, with only a protruding dome or corner to mark their burial places, so the Moslem system had overwhelmed the Persian nation, wrapping it in fatalistic inaction and corrupt quiescence until it existed only as a sign-post of the past." He himself was at the head of a movement which attempted to revive a purified Zoroastrism combined with Christianity, as a sole remaining hope and means of regenerating Persia and re-kindling the national Persian spirit of a great past. For it must be borne in mind that the mighty Persia of old, the Persia of antique grandeur, was not Mahomedan, but possessed a beautiful national faith, the Arian faith

of Zoroaster, expressed in the Zend-Avesta. Persia never passed into Christianity, and up to the period of its conquest by Islâm it possessed a national ideal in faith, culture and government. The modern Persian, a schismatic in Islâm is the sign of anti-Moslem sentiment whose stubborn, if sporadic, manifestations of resistance have torn the nation into various sects — shreds of a dismembered people.

Those interested in Persian persistency cannot afford to blind their eyes to these considerations or to the fact that from the moment of the coming of Moslem mastery in Persia, its rulers have never been national, but always foreign, from the Arabs and others to the Seldjuk Turks, on down to the Khadjar Turk of to-day.

The dream of Islâmic conquest and the re-establishment of a great Islâmic State and the idea of a world Khalifat is promulgated by the religious brotherhoods like the Khadrias and the Senussis, mystic as-

sociations with political objects. The first of these brotherhoods was created in the eighteenth century of our era, the other, in modern times by the Sheikh-al-Senussi in Algeria in re-action against the French conquests in Northern Africa. The Senussi are a powerful fighting order created for resistance to non-Moslem invasion, and with the militant object of converting all lands of the world to the faith of the Prophet. The Sheikh-el-Senussi, claiming descent from Fatima, the daughter of Mahomet, appears to have rights to the Khalifat superior to those of the Turkish Sultan. Another wing of the Islâmic ("Pan-Islâmic") revival is found in the so-called westernised Moslems or Young Turks, no less fanatic in loyalty to Islâm, but professing other methods than those of the mystic brotherhoods. These "Westerners" or Young Turks repose upon conceptions of reforms and organised State which, however, contains the self-annulling elements of contradiction, as their

State — a hybrid creation — would not be based either upon modern constitutionalism or entirely upon the historic interpretation of Islâm. Although there have been earnest and dignified figures among them, in general, their methods of propaganda include press-campaigning, public pose, self-advertisement, and theatrical clamour, which joined to an air of self-sufficiency causes their plans and work to be regarded in Europe as more or less harmless.

The signs of the time, however, must not be misread. Islâm, a failure where higher civilisation is concerned, is an educational force of vitality where lower civilisations or savages come under its sway. The spread of Islâm in Asia, India and China, especially in Africa among the Negro tribes, is amazing. There, the work of the Christian missionary disappears as chaff before the wind. The attempt of Christian missionaries to convert Moslems is a labour of Sisyphus. Witness the utter

failure of Cardinal Lavigerie's work in Algeria, where the famine of 1870 had given him children and orphans as converts, and the story of the Franciscan missions in Morocco. The Protestant missions fare no better. Whatever the underlying causes of these failures may be, among the many theories adduced, including that one illustrated by the answer of the South African black-man when questioned on the subject: —"They (the different sects and missionaries) have not yet settled among themselves what it is. When they get it and give it to us we will take it," the fact remains, that meanwhile they are leaving fetishism and embracing Mahomedanism, which, at least, is a destroyer of idols in Africa as it was in Asia. Islâm brings to the savage, an ideal more within his scope of understanding, a civilisation, a social status and organisations. Christianity brings him principles and conceptions of high philosophy which he cannot understand.

So in China, in Asia and in Africa down to Cape Colony, Mahomedanism spreads, enlarging the realm of Islâm, and carriers of the Khourân, or as they announce themselves, the "Comers before Conquest," go before the "Bariak-al-Sherif" the Green Flag of the Prophet, the visible sign of Moslem Empire and Rule — Islâm.

Therein lies the question of the future of Africa to-day, the colonising experiment of Europe; will it be a white-man's land, developed by colonial expansion, Christian and Western in civilisation, or will it be the land of the Black — The Empire of Islâm to-morrow?

C. LOCAL ASPECT OF THE NEAR EASTERN PROBLEM.

By the beginning of the fourteenth century the Turkish Dynasty of Osman had succeeded in creating a military and theocratic Osmanli State in Asia Minor. This work had been accomplished ruth-

lessly by fire and sword, massacre and devastation. All civilisation and fragments of past peoples which they found in their path were relentlessly destroyed and their national conscience obliterated by the extinction of their cultural traditions and learning, and the forced imposition of the Turkish tongue, a language possessing no literary means of expression.[1]

The original invading horde (of Erthrogul in the thirteenth century), said to have been not more than one thousand strong, had ceaselessly swollen its ranks to a dominating size by terrorising the masses of the inhabitants into forced allegiance to Islâm. Its fighting forces were formed and recruited in the main from vast numbers of young boys, who were carried away from their parents in infancy and carefully trained up to the sole business of organised slaughter and the lust of conquest. So was created that perpetual army of occu-

[1] The Turkish literature is forced to borrow from the Arabic and Persian in order to arrive at expression.

pation and ravage called the Osmanli nation.

During the history of the Turks in Asia and their stay in Europe, they created no culture, no monuments of civilisation, nor art; they have given to the world no statue, no picture, no music, no poem, no play, no architecture, no social grandeur, no creative statesmanship. The minaret, frail as the voice of the muezzin, and poetic as his call, was borrowed from other nations. Even in turning Santa Sophia into a mosque, the Saints on the walls, rich in coloured and golden mosaic, were whitewashed over and dimmed from sight.

Like a plague of locusts the Moslem masters fed upon the treasures of the fields which they left bare, and to-day the Turk, finally packing back across the Bosporus in the receding Osmanli tide eastwards, leaves behind him nought but vast mournful stretches of untilled land, whose caked soil grips the vestiges of the ruin he wrought. The broken cart-wheels and

over-turned cars, miserable roads, the wretched huts, the crumbling bridges and decaying remains of the civilisations he found,— all, in the track of the Turk, is rotting wreck and desolation.

In 1355 the Osmanlis crossed the Dardanelles to the European shores of the Marmara Sea, occupied Gallipoli and fortified themselves at Bulair on the small neck of the peninsula, and thenceforward for the next centuries the destinies of the Balkan lands and of all Europe moved in a changed course. From that first foot-hold in Europe they slowly, step by step, crushed the Christian States in the Balkans and finally, at the end of the fifteenth century, after having gained possession of the last Servian State, they were able in a single battle to overthrow the Hungarian Kingdom, and for the next one hundred and sixty years their border of empire was near the walls of Vienna. During that time the Hapsburg ruler payed tribute to

the Sultan at Constantinople. Then was the period of the greatest extent of the Osmanli realm, stretching far over Syria, into Arabia, Egypt and the coast of Northern Africa; the Ottoman fleet and pirate ships making the Mediterranean Sea and its coasts their play-ground. The wars of 1683-89 marked the turning point. Up to then, the efforts of Europe were directed toward withstanding the tide of Turkish conquest. With those wars the receding of Turkish power began, and step by step as they had come, so they began to depart, and to-day before our own eyes, in disordered array, the vestiges of that invasion, asking vain aid of the old walls at Bulair, their first fortress and sign of the yoke they laid upon the land, are making their way back across the Marmara to Asia, driven by the soldiers of the Allied Nations of the Balkans.

When the Turk entered Europe he found there the territorial remainder of

the Roman Empire of the East, with all its vast culture, the continuation of Rome and Greece. There was a Bulgarian Kingdom, with its culture developing on lines radiating from Bysanz, stretching over Danubean Bulgaria and Southern Bulgaria on both slopes of the Balkans. There were the independent Greek Principalities and Duchies, still full of the echoes of the glories that were Hellas. There was the Servian Empire, composed of the various Servian Kingdoms stretching from the Adriatic to near Salonika, englobing Albania in the West, and parts of old Bysanz in the East. A State-formation which from its inception was always a constitutional Monarchy, having a Parliament. The Serb Jury was an old institution and in the Servian Codex of Laws, compiled by the Emperor Dushan in 1346, there was guarantee to every citizen of equality before the law. The Sovereign, King or Emperor, was not above the law, and could be sued in the Courts of Justice

by the humblest of his subjects, see Art. 139-171-172 of that Codex.[1] In the arts of peace the Servians of that time were far advanced. Latin and Greek classics were translated long before Italy began its renaissance and many Servians took part in that cultural re-birth, being counted among the Italians of that period. The Hospice, to-day belonging to the Russians in Jerusalem, was built and founded by Servian rulers of the Middle Ages.

For a hundred and fifty years the Turks had to fight before they could overcome the Balkan nations. One by one those Christian peoples lost their State-formations, their sovereignty as nations being forced into abeyance by the Asiatic conqueror. First the Bulgar, then the Greek and Bysantine, the Albanian; and finally, the last Servian State-formation, had fallen, but for all that, the Turk had not entirely

[1] See "The Servian People," pp. 270-271.

conquered the nation nor subdued its spirit. In the rocky fastnesses of the Black Mountains, later called by Europe Montenegro, the Servian defied the Turk and was unconquered. It is the pride to-day of the Serb to point to many a rocky dell in the mountains of the Serb block of territory, even beyond the Black Mountains, where never the foot of Turk has trod, eyries where the Servian eagle awaited the time when he could again take flight and soar in freedom over his lands.

Continually throughout that century and a half of defence against Turkish onslaught, the Balkan peoples, Greek, Bulgar and Serb sought in vain the help and aid of Europe. Not only was that aid denied to them, but as their forces were fully engaged in the endeavour to beat back the Turkish attack, the moment was seized upon by certain western powers as propitious opportunity for territorial aggrandisement at their expense. So Venice, Hungary and Austria were the willing aids

of the Turkish conquerors, unmindful that their turn might come later, and come, it did, Hungary became the prey of the Turk. During the following three centuries up to the French revolution, the Serbs, and also the Greeks, whose spirit of independence the Turk was never able to crush out, were the willing allies of every European power that warred against the Turk. They fought, hoping to regain their lost liberties, and trusting in the assurances they received from different powers, who made use of their assistance. Serbs composed the armies which defended Vienna; Serbs formed the troops which in the years 1683-89 broke Turkey's power of advance, and caused the Osmanli hosts to fall back; Serbs were the soldiers of Austria, of Venice, of Spain, and with Albanians and Greeks together they were the soldiers of Naples; each war of Russia, of Austria, of Spain, Venice and Naples, found its echo in the Balkans, and revolts and insurrections shook the Ottoman power. The

most terrific of those convulsions was that of St. Sava. In that insurrection, the Serbs, in 1597 to 1606 in aid of the Austro-Spanish-Turkish war, rose against the Turk and for a time held all the lands west of Sophia clear from Ottoman troops. But, as it always happened in Austro-Serb relations, they were abandoned by Austria, when she made peace with the Turks. The Balkan peoples in those three hundred years of revolts and risings had well-tested the faith of the Western nations, for whom they had spilt their blood. In return for promises of arms, ammunition and funds as well as of military aid in their fight against the Turks, which was logically also the battle of Christendom, they repeatedly undertook risings, often at moments ill-chosen so far as concerned their own interests, but dictated by the plans of their European allies. Those promises were never kept or else were but lamely fulfilled. Austria, Venice, Spain and even Russia failed to keep faith, and clearly they had

no intention of helping the insurgents to regain their lost freedom and re-establish independent States.

Characteristic of the dealings of Austria with Servia was the fate in 1689 of the Serb Prince George III. Brankovich who, relying upon the promises made by the Austrian ruler that he would help to establish an independent Servia, called the Serbs to arms against the Sultan. In answer to his proclamation of freedom for the Servians, the Hapsburg Emperor ordered his arrest and held him in prison to the end of his life, a captivity of twenty-two years.

In the eighteenth century the ideas of partitioning European Turkey between Russia and Austria, superseded all other plans, and the Balkan nations were drawn into the game played between Austria and Russia. The faith in foreign help had already vanished; the Serbs and the Greeks began to look more to their own efforts than to help from the outside.

Up to the end of the seventeenth century, the Turks were almost the only power in Europe which possessed a strong and well-organised regular army. From the inception of a Turkish State they owned that force in the janissaries, a military organisation formed to be the fiercest legion known to history. All the other European powers, perhaps with the exception of Venice and Spain, began only after the thirty years war to organise their fighting forces on the basis of a formally constituted standing army instead of the mercenary troops of the condottiere and the feudal levies. The end of the seventeenth century saw the Turkish janissaries in many an engagement opposed and defeated by those new regular troops.

The periodical insurrections of the Serbs, the never-ceasing guerilla warfare of the Servian Haydouks and Ouskoks, the Bulgarian Hillmen and the Klephts of the Greeks, since the days when their several sovereign State-formations had been over-

thrown, contributed powerfully to that chronic state of anarchy in the Ottoman realm and the penury of the Osmanli treasury.

Much-cited descriptions in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by German and French Ambassadors to the Sublime Porte of their journeys through Turkey, record the necessity of strong Turkish military guards along the highways. Certain direct roads had to be avoided in order to go out of the way of robber-bands, and it was necessary, as explained to them by the Turks, to fortify and double-guard the villages and places where they rested, lest the bands should swoop down upon them during the night, although the escort numbered several hundred janissaries. Those reports give vivid and realistic pictures of the unsubdued state of the country inhabited by Serbs and the conditions of insecurity to the conqueror, even on the great beaten paths from Belgrade to Sophia, which was the road of the Turkish armies

from Asia and Constantinople to the battle-fields of Hungary and the walls of Vienna.

Only during two short periods of time, was the Turkish State somewhat free from those turbulent conditions: — under the Grand-Vezirat of Mehemet Sokolovich in the reign of Suleyman the Magnificent, and under the Grand-Vezirat of Mohamed Kuprili, in the reign of Sultan Mohamed IV.

The defeat of the Ottomans at the end of the seventeenth century, the loss of Hungary, and the fixing of their borders on the Sava and Danube Rivers, brought the Balkan peoples into nearer contact with Austria and Russia. Up to that time the Serbs were unable to oppose organised forces to those of Turkey, but during the period of the eighteenth century, which in Europe — also in Austria and Russia — saw the development of the standing army, many Serbs took service in those armies, and during the Austrian and Rus-

sian wars with Turkey in that century, the Servian and Greek volunteers were trained according to military science, not more left to fight in the old irregular way, but enregimented into properly constituted formations, and so came into possession and practice of the knowledge of military organisation. The knowledge of the use of artillery, the use of cavalry in masses, and infantry and its fire in ordered line, was spread in their own countries by those volunteers on their return home after the wars.[1]

So it came about that at the end of the eighteenth century, during the revolt of Pasvan Oglou against the Sultan, when the Pasha of Belgrade called upon the Serb-head-men to provide some Serb fighting men in aid of the imperial troops, the Serb

[1] That return was made possible by an amnesty clause which, wiser than in former centuries, they had stipulated to be inserted in the Peace-treaties, before consenting to enlist as they had done of old, so willingly and spontaneously. Also the Turk was in necessity of them to till the fields and pay taxes.

was able to put into the field some battalions of infantry, well organised and drilled and commanded in the western style and manner, to the absolute astonishment of the Turks.

Anarchy in Turkey came to a climax at the end of the eighteenth century. The events contributing to that result were: the Russo-Turkish war, ending in the treaty of Kutchuk Kainardji in 1774, which gave Russia the right to intervene in the affairs of Turkey as protector of the Orthodox Christians; followed by the Austro-Russian-Turkish war which ended in 1792 with new territorial losses to Russia; and after that, the French expedition to Egypt under Bonaparte; in 1798, revolts of the Wahabit sect of Islâmic reformers in Arabia; the revolts in Syria; and finally, the recognition by Sultan Selim of the necessity of reforming the administration and army system, tardy attempts at which made the conditions of anarchy complete. Following Selim's ineffectual efforts of reform, each

Pasha governing in his Pashalik, undertook to make himself independent of the Sultan, supported in that attempt by the janissaries, whom the Sultan had decided to suppress and replace by troops levied and trained according to the new methods of the European armies. The resultant upheaval throughout Turkey was accompanied by violences against Christian populations. In Servia, in the Pashalik of Belgrade, the spectacle of the capacity of the Serb to bring organised troops to the aid of the Pasha, was the signal to attempt the disarming of the people which was begun with fierce and relentless energy. The Serbs answered by insurrection, which had been secretly long foreseen and prepared for. The battle of Ivankovatz, in 1806, where a Turkish army of 40,000 men were defeated by some few thousands of Serbs with only one cannon, was the turning point in the history of the Balkan nations. The battle of freedom had begun, the battle to recall from abeyance the national

sovereignty so long over-ridden by Turkish domination. No longer expecting help from a foreign State, whose battles they had won, nor looking for delivery from the outside, but setting themselves firmly to fight for their own homes, their old ideals, their nationality, the Serbs bent their full forces in a supreme effort to throw off the Ottoman yoke.

A new era of nation-making was dawning in the Balkans.

For eleven years from 1804 to 1815, first, under the skilled leadership of the brave mountaineer, Kara George, the Serbs defeated the Turkish forces, one after another; then, being overwhelmed in 1813, by a Turkish army far superior in numbers, they rose again in 1815, under the leadership of another mountaineer, Milosh Obrenovich, and drove the Turk from the Pashalik of Belgrade for good. The modern State of Servia was founded and that small part of the old Servian realm became the nucleus of the entire re-

demption of the Serblands, which began piece by piece to be won back under the national flag.

During that war of liberation, the Serb had shown not only valour and bravery on the battle-field, but the capacity to organise a State.

Two years later, in 1817, the famous Hetnike Hetaira was founded by Greek merchants and refugees in various European cities. In 1821 Ypsilanti raised the standard of revolt, was followed by Archbishop Germanos, Kolkotronis, Mavromichalis, Kanaris and others; the Turks were driven out of Greece and the war raged with changing success and failure till in 1828 France, England and Russia intervened and in 1830, constituted the modern Kingdom of Greece.

The spirit of nationality, which thus inspired, first the Serbs in their successful wresting of the Pashalik of Belgrade out of Turkish hands; then the Greeks, in earning their freedom, interposed a check upon

the various projects for the partition of Turkey, between Austria and Russia. That principle, in its assertion of the will of the people as the root of sovereignty, ran counter to the theory of the divine right of Kings, which was expounded and re-proclaimed by Austria and her Chancellor Metternich and made the corner-stone of European and world status at the Congresses of Vienna, Laibach and Verona. It was the era of treaty-obligations, identified with government by divine institution, solidarity among the powers for the observance of those treaties and the upholding of governments and government-systems as guaranteed by those treaties, even against the will of the governed. A theory which has ever and ever again recurred in history under various guises. In our time, it steals in under the cloak of the project of a world-police-force to coerce for world-peace. Such peace plans all conceive that a people might become dissatisfied with its government and

attempt its overthrow by revolution; those plans would provide against that eventuality, some quite frankly stating that the international police force would be employed in case of revolt against any government at the demand of the government in occupation. Such, too, was the theory of Metternich a hundred years ago. Revolution and the right of a people to assert its will was a crime.

The antagonism between England and Russia, England, seeing in Russian advance a menace to India, brought England to the side of Austria in all that concerned Turkey, who could generally rely also on French support. The integrity of the Turkish dominions, was the rule laid down, and in the interior affairs of Turkey, Austria, England and France stood for the suppression of all moves toward the liberation of the Christian peoples, while Russia saw her interest in their advance and escape from Ottoman rule. The ulterior motives of one and all were similar, and

aimed at the partition of Turkey, each expecting to obtain his share in its final distribution. Russia's plan was to help the Balkan people and bind them to her, hoping in time, by gratitude to gather them in. England's plan was to hold Russia back barring her way through the Straits of the Bosporus and Dardanelles. Austria's aim was the same: by intrigue, promise, threat and gradual military occupation, to fall sole heir to the "Sick-man's" inheritance and incidentally to earn the gratitude of the governments of western Europe for effectively restraining Russia.

Those policies led to recommendations to the Turks of all kind of reforms and offers of help in their practical execution, coupled with interference in the interior affairs of the independent Balkan States such as Servia, Montenegro, Wallachia and Moldavia, and Greece. In every one of those countries there soon appeared a party which took its cues from an Austrian, English or French diplomatic rep-

resentative; another party which listened to the Russian wishes. In Servia and in the other countries, Austria and England stood for absolute government and anti-parliamentarism, while Russia stood for constitutional government and weak central authority.

The reforms failed in Turkey and political turmoil was the rule in the Balkan States.

The Turkish reform proclamation of 1835, the "Tanzimat," and the reform proclamation of 1856 called "Hatti Houmayoun" although failures, were used to fortify the demand for the status quo and the integrity of Turkey, put forward as justifications of the Anglo-Franco-Turkish Alliance against Russia in the Crimean war, and opened the money markets of Europe to the Turkish Government and its officials. Conditions in the interior administration were not improved and remained as they had been since the days

when the Turks had come and conquered those lands.

The fall of Prince Alexander Karageorgevich in Servia, his replacement by Prince Milosh Obrenovich, who upon his death was succeeded by his son Prince Michael, placed at the head of the Servian nation a man full of energy with great national ambitions ably aided by his minister Illya Garashanin. He was able to hold Servia free for some time from the results of the rival intrigues of Austria, England and Russia, and entered into understandings with Bulgars, Albanians, Greeks and Bosnians for a common attempt at the final overthrow of Turkey. His accession coincided with the Cretan insurrection of 1858. National agitation began to revive in the Balkans. The time was well chosen for agitation as Europe was occupied in watching first Italy, then Germany, in the making of their nations, and as Austria was the power at whose expense

that nation-making was proceeding, she was forced to momentarily withdraw her interference in the interior affairs of the Balkans. Hayduks and insurrectionary bands began to overrun Herzegovina and Bulgaria. Montenegro's success against the Ottomans resulting in extension of borders, gave new courage to the Serbs still under Turkey and awakened national spirit among the Bulgarians. Finally, by 1870, the Servian Government, with the aid of Russia had succeeded in obtaining from the Sultan the creation of a "Slavonic Exarch" to be the head of the Slavs in Turkey proper. Servia and her statesmen like Garashanin and Ristich, were then still under the influence of the "liberal movement" of 1848, the movement of "Gross-Deutschland" of Germany and of a greater "Slavia" among the dreamy Slavs, so that the narrower national point of view was entirely lost sight of in Servia. The creation of the "Slavonic Exarch" which the Serbs had worked for, was meant to be a

means of protection and national growth to all Slavs in Turkey whether Serb or Bulgar. But the young Bulgarian people, just awakening from a sleep of centuries, had its nation still to make and was inspired with no such idealistic conceptions of a kind of cosmopolitan Slavia to be in common between all Balkan Slavs. The Bulgars recognised in the Slavonic Exarch simply an instrument of national Bulgarian propaganda ready to hand, with the result that the Slavonic Exarch became by rapid degrees the "Bulgarian Exarch."

The timely assassination, timely for Austria, of Prince Michael of Servia, stopped the national movement for a time, but that movement, like phœnix from ashes again arose some years later, with the Herzegovinian insurrection and the Bulgarian revolt, followed by the war of Servia and Montenegro against Turkey in support of that insurrection, which brought in its train the Russo-Turkish war, closed by the Berlin Congress. A

Bulgarian State was now created and came into the comity of independent Balkan States, Servia, Montenegro, Rumania and Greece, which had already succeeded in winning freedom and forming themselves out of portions of the territories belonging to their nations, the sovereignty of which had been lost by the Turkish conquest.

Austria's occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina as the mandatory of the powers, was a check to the dreams and plans of liberation of the peoples of the Balkans, and was accompanied by a new period of intrigues, a foreign pulling and hauling in the interior political affairs of the Balkan countries. The miserable interior conditions in Servia and Greece and the overthrow of Alexander of Battenberg in Bulgaria were the results of those foreign efforts to crush Balkan independence in the egg. With the object of preventing a united working between Bul-

garia and Servia, Austria induced King Milan to undertake the war against Bulgaria in 1886, that act of folly, injurious to Servian national interests, was in keeping with the secret treaty by which King Milan had already in 1882, bound himself and his dynasty to do the Austrian bidding.[1]

Austria to-day, is playing the same game in Rumania where by means of influence in Rumanian politics, she is attempting

[1] That convention made by King Milan and his Foreign Minister without the knowledge of the other Ministers practically put Servia in a position of an Austrian dependency. It was kept strictly secret, its existence being unknown not only to the public but even to succeeding Cabinets, and from that time until the wiping out of the last Obrenovich with the assassination of King Alexander in 1903 the Servian King was obliged to obey the orders of Vienna, privately conveyed to him by the Austrian military attaché in Belgrade (see Das Ende der Obrenovich by Vladan Georgevich, former Servian Prime Minister). The Servian Cabinets hampered and hindered by conditions of whose origin they were kept in ignorance, were forced to see the country brought to verge of ruin in all its relations both interior and foreign — (see The Servian People — Vol. II page 708).

to bring about a break between that country and Bulgaria over a mere bagatelle — a matter of third-rate concern to Rumania, her rather bald object being to distract the Rumanian national aspirations from their real and important interests in contiguous Austro-Hungarian provinces of Transylvania and Bukovina, which deflect their border-lines far into the Rumanian interior, enclosing there several millions of purely Rumanian inhabitants, which are still under the Austro-Hungarian flag. As in 1886, Austria's aim was to draw the attention of Servia eastward to the Bulgarian border away from the westerly direction of Bosnia and Herzegovina, both Servian lands, which were being penetrated by Austria, so to-day, Vienna works to fix the eyes of Rumania as well as those of Bulgaria on a point of the Black Sea coast, withdrawing the national attention from the opposite point of the compass where within Austrian borders lies Rumania irredenta. The Rumanian Government act-

ing thus under the guidance of the Austrian party is not only betraying the true national interests light-heartedly, but is allowing Austria to create between Rumania and Bulgaria a standing cause of irritation, — a kind of Rumano-Bulgar "Alsace-Lorraine" question in miniature. Nothing could well be less sagacious on the part of those responsible for Rumanian destiny than this policy which for a practically valueless strip of neighbour's land, sacrifices the future of nearly three and a half million Rumanians.

The reforms in Turkey promised by the Berlin treaty, article XXIII, were foredoomed to remain unfulfilled, because not only of the conflicting interests of European States but, by reason of Turkish inertia, unvarying except under coercion. Armenian affairs best exemplify the situation. It had been Russia's intention to create an autonomous Armenia under Russian protection. England opposed that plan and

with the so-called Cyprus treaty, herself assumed the supervision of the reforms in Asia Minor. When the Armenian massacres occurred Russia and England were at a deadlock, no other power interfered, the Armenians were slaughtered by the tens and hundreds of thousands, the world looking on, uttering only platonic protests which Turk and Sultan disdained to notice. That supine attitude of Christendom was interpreted by Islâm as a sign of western helplessness before the Turk and was a mighty means of strengthening "Pan-Islâmic" propaganda.

Abdul-Hamid inaugurated "Pan-Islâm" with the intention of strengthening the rule of the Osmanli in Asia and forging a weapon with which to discipline the powers, should his Empire be imperilled. That wily old Sultan, a scourge to Europe, but the most astute and masterful of Turkish rulers during the past two centuries, knew that the days of Ottoman rule in Europe were numbered and bent his ener-

gies to the task of consolidating his power in Asia. The Armenians were a thorn in the side, occupying a territory, which, by its situation and the character of its surface-relief, possesses a strategic importance in relation to advance towards the Persian Gulf, India, Suez, or Constantinople. Killing off the Armenians and replacing them by Osmanlis, that position would be re-enforced in its strength against Russia and become a stronghold whence Ottoman domination could be extended across the Moslem lands of Persia, Afghanistan and into India.

The pretext for those massacres was found in the Armenian political societies formed for liberation and the ultimate erection of an Armenian State. Societies like the Hintchak, the Droshak and others were organised on the model of the Macedonian societies and committees.

In 1885-86 a campaign of propaganda in a political sense with the ultimate object

of an insurrection in Turkey was begun by an organisation called, the " Central Committee for the Autonomy of Macedonia and Albania." [1] The Standard of that organisation was " Macedonia for the Macedonians "; its object was to obtain the execution of article XXIII of the treaty of Berlin, separating the nationalities, Serb, Bulgar and Greek into homogeneous groups, foreseeing their ultimate junction with their cultural centres the neighbouring States of Servia, Montenegro, Bulgaria and Greece.[2]

[1] The author was one of its first members.

[2] From the first the guiding idea of the author was that the organisation might be used as means of freeing the Serb lands still under foreign sway, and so unify the Serb nation into one State out of a half dozen States and provinces, so as to accomplish what for centuries, had been the Servian dream of bringing into one political entity and body politic the entire Serb nation, all of one race, one language, one cultural thought and expression throughout the entire Serb block of territory. A vital part of that design was to secure a Servian outlet to the Sea, without which, there can be no Servian development. The ultimate aim was a State commanding a permanent and solid position among the nations of the world,

The task before the Committee was not only to rouse the people to remembrance of their rights as people, but to educate them in the principle of co-operation for the attainment of one supreme purpose — their liberation from the Turkish yoke. Efforts were made also to counteract sectional frictions and hostilities which had been engendered among them by national propaganda carried on by the agents of the independent bordering States representing the races to which they belonged. The next task was to bring before the world knowledge of the conditions in Turkey, and of the fact that almost the entire population of European Turkey was non-Turk,

able to progress unimpeded and perfect its civilisation, according the full measure of its national genius. Such a result could only be hoped for in harmonizing the efforts, not only of the Serbs, but also of the Bulgars and the Greeks. It was the object of endeavor to inculcate in them all, the important fact that a Servia on such lines is a conditio sine qua non of a greater and stronger Bulgaria and Greece; and that, for the same reason, a strong Bulgaria and a strong Greece would offer conditions most propitious for a strong and free Servia.

and was in ferment, striving to win freedom.

To that end the Paris Macedonian Committee was founded in 1894,[1] the London Macedonian Committee was formed in 1896 and re-organised in 1902.[2] The ac-

[1] The author went to Paris for the founding of the Macedonian Committee there, in September 1894, and to England for the re-organisation of the London Committee in 1901-2. Reference: British Parliamentary Report — Turkish Affairs, 1902-3, p. 177, inclosure No. 213—"Reports on Events in Macedonia during May, 1902." . . . The organ of Michailov's Committee ("*Reformi*"— Sophia, Bulgaria), reports that Evgenyi Lazarov*ich* who six or seven years ago founded the Paris Macedonian Committee is trying to form a similar one in London to prevent English foreign policy from being influenced by the Phil-hellenism of the Byron Society. . . ."

At the time when every effort had been exerted to plant the conception of harmonious coöperation among the several national sections in Macedonia it was necessary to combat certain political groups in foreign lands who, in spite of the irrevocable policy of their governments of Turkish maintenance in Europe, made it their work to incite unrealisable ambitions in some one section, which became untractable, under the delusion that such or such a foreign State would enforce a demand by that particular national group for the whole of European Turkey.

[2] As organs of the Paris and London Committees the

tivities of the Committee are recorded and referred [1] to in the British Parliamentary Reports called "Blue-Books"— Report of H. B. M. Foreign Secretary to Parliament — Turkish Affairs 1903-4, pp. 307, 308, 309 — corres. N° 378 — inclosure N° 378 — "Macedonian Committee to the Marquess of Lansdowne," September 4, 1903 — signed: Lazarovich.

Meanwhile the Servian, Bulgarian and Greek Governments opened Schools and

Eastern European Review and *L'Autonomie* were published fortnightly in 1902 in London by the author, who owned and edited both periodicals. They were printed in English and French and sent gratis to all the Governments, Embassies, Parliaments, Newspapers and prominent political personages of all the great Capitals of the world. Copies were also deposited at the British Museum, and the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburg and Dublin.

The London Macedonian Committee had no connection whatever with the so-called "Balkan Committee" composed of several young Englishmen whose aims and purposes were entirely concerned with English politics. They formed their Committee in London in 1903 after the outbreak of the Insurrection.

[1] *The Quarterly Review,* London, October, 1903, page 512 and in the press of the time.

supported Churches in their co-national regions still under Turkish rule. Apostolo Margariti, a patriot Koutzo-Vlach, aroused Rumanian interests in the Koutzo-Valachs of Macedonia.

In 1893 the so-called Superior Macedonian-Adrianople Committee was founded in Sophia for the purpose of a purely national and aggressive propaganda in Macedonia, aided by the Bulgarian Government. That organisation was for a time headed by Boris Sarafof and General Tzontcheff. In Greece the Pan-Hellenic Society worked at full steam with government aid. In Servia a similar force was at work. In 1895 the so-called "Interior Organisation" was founded by Grueff and Deltcheff, its motto was like that of the Central Committee's, "Macedonia for the Macedonians" but with aim and methods differing somewhat from the older one, which had first proclaimed that motto, it developed vast ramifications of which the proto-type was the Italian Carbonari organisation, but

modified so that it should form and prepare a strong military force for the eventual insurrection.

By 1897 the country was well honeycombed with those different committees and societies and the commotion occasioned by the Armenian massacres in Europe drew the general attention vividly to the work of the committees. The Paris and London committee was able to powerfully illustrate their propaganda by those gruesome events. The London committee received from England's Grand Old Man, a letter in which Mr. Gladstone accepted and proclaimed the slogan of the committee, "Macedonia for the Macedonians," making it ring out to the world.

The Macedonian agitation as may be understood was not calculated to mitigate the already chronic state of anarchy in Turkey; their aim was the overthrow of that régime. This speculation was justified by the principle that conquest, though it may usurp, cannot abolish the sovereignty

of a nation, which remains in abeyance only so long as the militant forces of the conqueror are strong enough to prevent its re-assertion, that to resist conquest is the duty and the right of a nation and of the individuals composing that nation; that the action to weaken and destroy the forces of the conqueror and to throw off his yoke is not only the duty of a nation but is also the proof of the honesty of its ethical, cultural and spiritual morality and of the honesty and character of the individuals composing the nation. Those principles are basic and upon them were founded the agitation and movement to overthrow the Turk. As a Serb, the author had first in view the recall from abeyance of the Servian sovereignty and the unification of the Serb race, but the plans of his committees included the securing of the same results for the other Balkan peoples, the Greeks, the Bulgars and the Albanians. With the accomplishments of those several unifications the European part of the Near

Eastern Question and a part of another European problem will have been solved. It should be said once and for all and clearly understood that the unhampered possession of the entire Balkan Peninsula by the Balkan peoples solely and their control of those lands, free from outside interference, presents conditions necessary not only to the comfort and progress of those peoples, but to the peace of Europe, so far as regards all issues affected by that region of the world.

By 1896-7 the agitation had progressed and the Ethnike, the Greek Pan-Hellenic society exercised strong pressure on the Greek Government, believing that any move of Greece and hostilities with Turkey would bring about a general rising of all the Macedonian organisations and action by Servia, Bulgaria and Montenegro. The insurrection in Creta gave Greece the desired occasion. Turkey declared war. Servia and Bulgaria, under irresistible pressure of the Powers, especially Austria and

Russia, abstained from intervening. The Macedonian Central and Interior Organisations were not prepared for an active campaign and realised that to enter the field with insufficient resources would be certain destruction. The Bulgarian and the Servian organisations made some little flutter but were restrained by their Governments. Greece, fighting alone, was outnumbered by the enemy and the Sultan's forces gained the last victorious campaign ever won by Turkish troops in Europe. Creta received from the Powers a separate status under a European Governor-General, the first being Prince George of Greece.

In Macedonia the discovery of a deposit of arms belonging to the committees, and increased agitation among the population, brought about repression in the usual Turkish forms. Arms were distributed to the Moslems and Albanians who were given a free hand as to methods to stamp out every move made by the committees.

Austria and Russia, who, after the Russo-Turkish war had under Bismark's guidance come to an understanding, concluded in 1897 an arrangement for enforcing Macedonian reforms and in 1902, Turkey finally promulgated a project of her own making, which left the vital abuses out of account and failed to abate the agitation. A rising was first planned for the autumn of 1902, for which most of the organisations came together to discuss a scheme of concerted action.[1]

However, in view of the strong European feeling that the Sultan should be allowed opportunity to execute his promises of reform, it was decided to postpone any armed operations until the following year — giving further time for getting arms and ammunition into the country. It was expected that by 1903 Servia, Montenegro, Greece and Bulgaria would be ready to

[1] In that connection a series of meetings, attended by Sarafof and other leaders, who came especially to England for that purpose, took place at the author's country-house in England in June, 1902.

bring a..ned force into co-operation with the " Comitadjis." [1]

Russia and Austria found the Turkish reforms inadequate and presented a memorandum making specific demands and in the month of February, 1903, called upon the Bulgarian and Servian Governments to disperse the organisations formed within their territories. In obedience to that request it was supposed that the Supreme Macedonian-Adrianople Organisation was dissolved. The Central Committees and the Interior Organisation were beyond the reach of the mandatory Powers and the spring of 1903 saw a period of violences inaugurated with the blowing up of the Ottoman Bank Building at Salonika.

The Turkish Government redoubled its measures of repression, mobilised several Army Corps and called out reserves. But the extreme methods employed by the Ottoman troops seemed only to further stif-

[1] Name given by the Turks to all adherents to the Macedonian revolt.

fen resistance and crystallize the courage of numbers of the population who previously had been wavering and who now swelled the ranks of the comitadjis.

The insurrection, which broke out in August, on the day of St. Ilya, was a large and well supported movement, in which the insurgents won some temporary success. By the middle of October the Turkish troops got the upper hand; the expected intervention of Servia, Bulgaria and Montenegro did not materialize; the change of ruler in Servia had some influence in that matter, as King Peter and his Government were occupied with the interior affairs of the country, and the pressure exercised by the great Powers imposed restraint. The different organisations attempted to negotiate with the Turkish Government to obtain some acceptance of their demands. [1]

[1] The author as delegate of the Central organisation, laid certain proposals embodied in a memorandum before the chancelleries of Europe, and negotiated with the Turkish authorities on a basis of new provin-

A convention called the "Murzsteg Programme" and to which Turkey assented in principle was elaborated between Austria and Russia for the enforcement of reforms and all other negotiations fell through.

The "Murtzsteg" programme demanded that the Turkish Inspector-General of Western European Turkey should be assisted by two civil agents, one representing Austria and one Russia for the

cial delimitations, according to nationality. The provinces or vilayets to be constituted by the suggested new boundaries were to receive in accordance with article XXIII of the treaty of Berlin a measure of self-government. The proposals also included agrarian reforms, regulation of the rental due the Moslem-feudal landlord from the Christian tenant and its collection by a local Christian board, the regulation of the taxes and their method of levying. As those financial and fiscal reforms would have given a higher revenue although lessening the burden of the tax-payer, and that surplus would have been sufficient to guarantee the service of a loan of about fifty million dollars, the author offered to the Turkish Government a loan of twenty-five million dollars the underwriting of which he obtained in London. See Appendix B-2.

supervision of the reforms and that the Military Police or Gendarmerie should be reorganised under the command of European Officers from several nations. De Georgis, an Italian General, was nominated for the Chief-command. Some months later at the suggestion of Lord Lansdowne,[1] the British Foreign secretary, these civil agents were to be assisted by a financial commission composed of delegates of England, France, Germany and Italy. Coerced by a fleet-demonstration the Sublime Porte yielded, but the passive resistance of the Turkish authorities, a kind of "sabotage," resulted in the absolute failure of the reform scheme. That scheme had taken

[1] Prior to Lord Lansdowne's suggestion to the Powers, the author, through the good offices of Sir Henry Drummond Wolff — (Privy Councillor, former High Commissioner for East Rumelia, Special Commissioner to Turkey, Minister to Persia, Ambassador to Spain, etc.) — had submitted to the British Foreign Office memoranda representing that any measure for the effective betterment of conditions for the Macedonian populations must be based on fiscal and agrarian reforms, especially concerning the fixing and collecting of taxes and rentals.

as basis, the demands formulated by the Central Macedonian Committee, but the foreign agents were without sufficient power of enforcement; as it was not supported by the Ottoman authorities and was looked upon askance and with mistrust by the Christian population, absolute failure was inevitable. After having been able to prevent an attempted rising that had been financed by private British and Austrian sources in 1904,[1] and which would not have furthered Macedonian or Balkan interests, the Central Macedonian Committee adopted a waiting attitude.

The interior organisation had spent its forces and split itself into different sec-

[1] The author retired at that period from active participation in the direction of that organisation with which he had been identified since 1886, in order to devote himself entirely to a work involving Servian development southward, including the securing of an outlet on the Ægean Sea, and the construction across Servia and old Servia through the rivers Morava and Vardar of a navigable waterway called the Danube-Ægean Canal. See Appendix — Danube — Ægean Canal.

tions, some re-enforcing the outside national propaganda, others remained under the leadership of several chiefs, among whom was Sandanski. The national propagandas directed from the neighboring lands, Servia, Bulgaria and Greece often forgot their common enemy the Turk, and fought among themselves, until by degrees, they began to perceive that apart from the natural causes arousing their jealous national passions, were hands from the invisible that shoved them forward into the cock-pit and clapped them on to the fray. Slowly, but in time, they came to realise that their hope lay in united action.

The conditions in European Turkey went from bad to worse. In Asia and in the Yemen (Arabia), since 1892, the Arab tribes had been in revolt, led by the Iman of Sâna, who received secret support from Great Britain and challenged the right of the Ottoman Sultans to the Khalifat. It was part of Lord Curzon's plan in split-

ting Islâm, to restore Mecca and the "Bariak-al-Sherif" to an Arabian Khalifa — under British protection. Those revolts in the Yemen were extremely costly to Turkey, necessitating expensive military expeditions and were ruinous to the discipline of her troops.

The utter decay of the Ottoman Empire was imminent, although endowed with an army, which, instructed and re-organised by a Germany military mission, was believed to be still of great military value; it had received a new glamour of efficiency from the easy victory of the Greek campaign and was considered to have become a valuable appendix of the German political position in Europe, Turkey, being looked upon as the fourth, though silent partner in the Triple Alliance.

The policy inaugurated by King Edward, his entente with France under Mr. Delcasse, which provoked Germany's retort, resulting in the Algesiras Conference

over the Morocco incident, and the Russo-Japanese war, which strained to a certain extent the new Anglo-French combination, led to an attempt to break up the Triple Alliance.

The Austro-Russian entente had already come to an end and was replaced by the so-called Reval programme with the ostensible object of reforms in which England was the binding member between the different powers with whom she had concluded arrangements, France, Austria and Russia.

Germany, which, in that new move, rightfully saw an attempt to isolate her and make a ring around her, advised Sultan Abdul Hamid to, himself, proclaim reforms on a radical scale in Turkey; which he did. A proclamation of a constitution, after the experiment of 1876, would not have been taken seriously by Europe. So, after approved methods a revolution was ordered by the Sultan; and, for that purpose, the Paris organisation of the Young Turks and the faithful Albanians whom

Abdul Hamid trusted implicitly, and who formed his body-guard at his palace in Constantinople, were entrusted with that task. The Young Turk Committee of Union and Progress were established at Salonika, and two officers charged to head the revolution. On July 22nd, Niazi Bey raised the standard of revolt in a small Macedonian Garrison town; on July 23rd, Major Enver Bey issued a proclamation restoring the Constitution; and on July 24th, the Sultan, under the menace of the whole army marching on Constantinople, issued an irradé re-establishing the Constitution of 1876. With the exception of some assassinations, matters of private hatred, the "revolution" went off like clock-work. Promises had been made to various Macedonian organisations which entered into the game, believing that some good might come out of it, one way or another. The reasons for the adherence of the Macedonian Committees and organisations were: primarily, the prospects of the withdrawal

of the European agents and the check to Austrian and Russian interference; especially Austrian, which, since the replacing of the Austro-Russian Murzsteg entente by the new Reval Anglo-French-Russian-Austrian programme, had indicated that Austria considered the field clear for her advance to Salonika — and, secondarily, the belief of those who were working for Macedonian liberation that a withdrawal of the European Concert from the Balkans would allow the Balkan States to act more freely and independently.

Europe accepted with as good grace as possible the Sultan's volte-face and the proclamation of a constitution, ushered in with the approved expression of the will of the Ottoman people. All foreign reform schemes being thus forestalled, the agents were withdrawn and Europe's intervention was at an end. Austria and Bulgaria, who would have the most profited by the English plan, took compensation for its failure; Austria annexed Bosnia and Her-

zegovina outright and Bulgaria proclaimed full independence and changed her status to that of a Kingdom. Austria-Hungary at the same time, by submitting Servia to a series of galling provocations and exciting the resentment already caused by the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, (Serb-lands), attempted to drive the Serbs onto the rocks of armed conflict, the aim being to further complete the Austro-Hungarian programme by the conquest of Servia and the extension of Hapsburg sway over all Serb-lands down to Salonika.

There existed in conjunction with the plans, an Anglo-Franco-Austrian project which would have become effective in case of a change of ruler in Austria, as was expected to take place in December, 1908, paying Austria for adherence to an anti-German combination with a free hand in all of Western European Turkey, including Albania and Salonika and eastward up to the Struma River. Germany's intervention on behalf of Austria's annexation of Bosnia

and Herzegovina, and Francis Joseph's non-abdication, forced general acceptance of the accomplished facts in Turkey.

Once its creatures were installed at Constantinople, the Committee of Progress and Union got out of hand. In Macedonia, as soon as the outward signs of European intervention were removed with the withdrawal of the foreign agents, the promises made by the Young Turks and Abdul Hamid to the various Macedonian organisations were further from realisation than ever, and the old strife and agitation rebegan. The Albanians, especially, who, on one side, cajoled by Italy, on the other, helped by Austria, had imagined that the new régime in fulfilment of alluring promises would reward them with new and extraordinary privileges, made known their disappointment by outbursts of violence and revolt. The Young Turk policy of Ottomanisation that is, Turkizisation, met with resistance from all non-Moslem popula-

tions. In Asia Minor the Kourds, impatient at delay in the fulfilment of their expectations, accused the Young Turks of acts that were un-orthodox, revolted, and finally obtained satisfaction by the massacres of Van, Mûsh and Adana. In the Yemen, a new Mahdi rose, and the whole Turkish Empire seethed with disorder. In Constantinople, divergencies of views brought about a crisis which ended in the active intervention of the Army. By a coup d'état the Sultan was deposed, and his brother, Mahomed, proclaimed in his place. Abdul Hamid was transferred to Salonika, which was the supreme seat of the Committee of Progress and Union.

The methods of procedure in the disarming of the Christian populations were accompanied with extreme violences, torture and murder, but, with the exception of the *London Times,* the foreign press, under some illusion, it is supposed, as to their real purpose, reported those outrages but scantily. The Albanian discontent resulted in

an uprising of the Malisory or Hill tribes, the Gheghas, north of the Shkumbi River, which was fought with varying luck on both sides.

The Balkan States in the meantime, under the constant menace of Austria, began to put their armed forces into trim and at the end of 1911, negotiations began to forecast their co-ordinate action against Turkey. In 1912, Austria came again forward with a project of reforms, expecting to be nominated as mandatary of Europe for enforcing article XXIII of the Berlin treaty. That action of Austria was not only a menace against the prospect of final liberty for the inhabitants of European Turkey, making imminent for them the same fate which had befallen Bosnia and Herzegovina, but it left no room for doubt as to the peril therein implied to the very existence of the Balkan States themselves. With full knowledge of the hardships involved in a winter-campaign, made vivid

by the remembrance of the appalling sufferings of the Russian soldiers amid the snow and ice of the Shipka Pass in 1878, the Allies, with an old and gangrenous adversary before them, and a more inexorable and formidable enemy in the rear, already on the move toward their final conquest, realised the necessity of going to war without delay.

They hastened the conclusion of their mutual arrangements and called upon Turkey for the execution of article XXIII of the Berlin treaty, knowing full well that Turkey would refuse to accede to their demand. The situation of friction on the Montenegrin border allowed the King of Montenegro, by a bold and swift action, to forestall the Powers and prevent them from executing the Hapsburg design of Austria's receiving, according to her old methods, a mandate of armed intervention and pacification. Montenegro, on October 8th, declared war on Turkey. On October 17th, the Sublime Porte, in answer to the

Ultimatum of Servia and Bulgaria, demanding the execution of the treaty of Berlin, declared war on Servia and Bulgaria. Greece followed on October 18th.

Before Austria, and her supporters among the other Powers, who had planned the partition of Turkey to their own profit, could find a way to intervene, the Allied armies, after kneeling to take Holy Communion as those ready for death, had swiftly crossed the Turkish borders. The Sultan's troops were defeated in one battle after another. The Servians routed and destroyed the Turkish Army at Koumanovo, Prilep and Monastir; the Bulgarians shattered the Ottoman Army at Kirikilisi and Lule Burgas; the Greeks defeated the Turks in several engagements and took Salonika. Three weeks after the declaration of war, the whole Turkish forces were practically annihilated, and the territory held by the remnants of the army of those who had, up to then, been the usurpers and conquerors of the Balkan peo-

ples, were restricted to a line of fortifications outside of the walls of Constantinople and the besieged garrisons of Adrianople, Scutari and Yanina. Everywhere the inhabitants hailed the Victors as brothers. Arming themselves with the weapons captured from the Turks they formed themselves into auxiliary aids of the troops of the Allies. As the triumphant Serbs entered Skoplya, after the three days' battle of Koumanovo, the people along the streets held up their babies, and the hands of little children waving in welcome blessing were more expressive than words or cries, of the meaning of liberation and of the unutterable joy of the inhabitants. The old Churches, for the first time in five-hundred years, rang with Te-Deums of gratitude and praise.

That unprecedented and glorious campaign of barely three weeks, had called out of past abeyance the sovereignty of the nations, Serb, Bulgar and Greek, which had been kept in thrall for centuries. The

Turk, as a State in Europe, has ceased to exist. Whatever be the outcome of the peace-negotiations, the Turkish phase of the Near Eastern Question in Europe is forever closed. But among the effects left over from the Turkish conquest in Europe, are the situations involving the completion and respective unifications of the Servian and Rumanian nations, intimately connected with the Austrian problem. These two States can only be satisfied with the calling from abeyance of the sovereignty of that part of each of their nations upon which Austria has imposed Hapsburg conquest and rule.

In the present war Bulgaria alone, of all the Allied States, has extended her borders entirely over the lands inhabited by her co-nationals and so consummates the building of her nation. Her natural borders include Constantinople and Gallipoli, the European shores of the Bosporus and the Dardanelles. Henceforth, her task is

to hold what she has won. Any eventual Bulgarian expansion lies eastward of the Marmora in Asia.

Greece has extended her borders northward, enclosing the more compactly Greek-inhabited districts and most of the Islands of the Ægean Sea, but her important trend of development is eastward and southward, and her State, as representing the Greek nation, will only be complete with the possession of all the Islands and that part of Asia Minor and its coasts inhabited by Greeks since antiquity.

Montenegro and Servia have been able to rescue from the Turkish yoke the main bulk of their old lands inhabited by Serbs, but the Serb nation is not yet rounded out in its making, as the sovereignty of several of the Serb provinces still lies in abeyance to a foreign domination.

Bulgaria has no vital interest in Salonika, where her presence would be an embarrassment and a danger to both Greek and Ser-

vian defence. She has, within her own natural borders, on the Ægean Sea, abundance of water-fronts and harbours.

Greece, in Salonika will find her best interests, both national and commercial, intimately interwoven with those of Servia. The gaining by Servia of a port at, or near, Salonika, is a matter of supreme importance to the country, both as regards national defence and economical development. With the completion of the Danube-Ægean Canal and the possession of the hinter-land, including the great longitudinal valley from the Danube to the Ægean Sea it lies alone with Servia to make of Salonika a port of first commercial rank, through which the rich commerce of central Europe would pass from the Danube through Servia by a water-level road, connecting Suez with the Northern Seas in a line straight as the crow flies, shortening that distance by 1500 miles.[1] These geographical and commercial con-

[1] See appendix.

siderations throw the future development of this magnificent harbour into the hands of Servia, and the more considerable the power of the Serb is at Salonika, the greater the value of that position to Greek advance in Asia Minor. On the other hand, Servia has every interest to see the Greek coasts of Asia Minor under the Greek flag.

Scutari, (Skodra or Skadar), and its harbour of San Giovanni di Medua are the natural appurtenances of Montenegro. The position of Scutari, as a fortress at the southeastern end of lake Scutari commanding the Moratcha valley, forms the only possible approach for the penetration of the mountain fastnesses of Montenegro. For that reason Scutari is a vital question of national defence and security for Montenegro; especially, in view of the dark future of Albania as at present foreshadowed in the proposals of the powers.

There has never existed an organised

State of Albania. The nearest approach to a united formulation, was during the single lifetime of Skander-beg, a Serb, who led the largest part of the clans of that district of the old Serb State, in a series of attempts to drive out the Turk. The native courage and other fine characteristics of these fierce mountain tribes, have been turned into evil courses by systematic methods which the Turk always employed in his administration. During the entire period of Ottoman rule, the districts of Albania were in a state of constant anarchy, and it was the Sultan's policy to make of the Albanians a robber-race, encouraging them in deeds of violence and bloodshed against their neighbours, thus using them as an irregular auxiliary force of oppression and extirpation against the Serbs and Greeks. They were allowed a free hand to commit against the Christians of European Turkey any act of lust, rapine or bloodshed and were confirmed in the possession of their spoils.

The sinister interference of Europe today in Albania, as it has been framed, is only a continuance of the use of these ignorant Hill-tribes to perpetuate disorder, which could only be aimed at the ultimate bestowal of the country upon some one of the big powers of Europe — an act of short-sightedness amounting to criminality, as it would, gratuitously create, a new Balkan problem. The erection and development of an autonomous Albanian State is entirely legitimate but is only possible without endangering the independence of the Albanians and of the other Balkan States, if the new Albania be the sole work of the Balkan States, themselves, and become a member of the Balkan league, whose prime interest it is that the Albanians should form a strong and organised people, free and independent of all foreign interference.

There can be no independence of Albania except that guaranteed by the Balkan States.

Interference by the outside powers or any one of them in that part of the Balkan Peninsula would mean, not only the creation of a hot-bed of foreign intrigue and continual peril to the independence of the other Balkan States, but would also entail indefinite delay of Albanian development, as no foreign State is coming there with the honest intention of creating an independent Albania. On the contrary, their aim is to cripple the whole peninsula, which would be, either wrecked anew, bringing endless war, or, the Balkan States would be obliged in self-defence — perhaps after much further bloodshed and misery, to forcibly occupy the Albanian Hills and administrate the people in the common interests of the Balkan nations.

A peculiarity of conditions in the present Balkan alliance is, that each and all of the Allied States has a particular interest in favouring the normal and legitimate

development of each and all of the other members of the League.

Occupation of the Servian plateau by Austria-Hungary or loss of Servian and Montenegrin independence, would make Bulgaria, as well as Greece, the prey and Vassals of the Hapsburgs; and the other Balkan States are bound to support Servia and Montenegro in their relation to that new problem which is beginning to confront Europe — the problem of the agglomeration, called Austria-Hungary.

D. INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF THE NEAR EASTERN PROBLEM.

Prior to the coming of the Turk, the Orient Problem lay in the contest between Bysanz and Rome, the struggle for world-supremacy of the Papacy, in the attempts of the Roman Church to bend the Eastern Church into recognition of the supremacy of the See of Rome. The crusades against Islam were one aspect of that phase. The conquest by the crusaders of

Constantinople and the erection of the Latin Empire and the Frankish States in Greece and the Islands; the wars of Naples, Venice and Hungary against the Servian State, which continued when the Ottoman Turks attacked, first, Bysanz, and then, the Servian State, were all actions in that war against the Eastern Church, waged by the Popes in assertion of the old theory of Rome as the centre and source of supreme authority — Universal Rule from Rome. [1]

[1] That conflict has survived to the present time. In the history of the Serbs under Hapsburg yoke, and the literature and other means of propaganda put forth to plead justification of Austria's policy toward the Balkan States, one of the arguments always advanced is that Austria acts for the Roman Catholic Faith as against the "night" of the Eastern Church. This attitude, sowing discord between Christians, is strongly condemned by liberal and progressive Roman Catholic Servians, whose standard is that of the enlightened Roman Bishop Strossmayer: political brother-hood a sacred principle among co-nationals, to be kept separate from the issues of Church fealties.

It should be said in foreign lands where the character of the Eastern Church is very imperfectly understood, that nowhere in all Christendom are the ideals of Christ more sublimely expressed or brought more

The question of the Balkans to-day, of the fate of Asiatic Turkey, of Egypt and of Persia, all component parts of the Near Eastern Question, beyond their local aspect, possess other and more far-reaching importance, from the fact that the lands they affect, being washed by the waters of the Eastern Mediterranean, Suez, the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf, and traversed by the great land-highways between the industrial centres of the West and the vast unconquered markets of the Far Orient, are of acute international interest, and enter vitally into the considerations and policies of all Empire-building nations.

In that prodigious effort of Empire-

intimately into daily life or more definitely embedded in local social institutions and the relations between man and man based on "brother-hood" than in the Eastern Church. Her formulas of Communion and invocation speak from the heart of nature — yet divinely wise, to nature's God, suggestive of conceptions peculiarly Arian, indicative of profound causes, rooted perhaps in far antiquity, which moved the great white races of the earth to be the first to recognise Him as their own.

building, the great nations of Europe set their borders far beyond their territorial limits, marking out aims of future conquests in the realms of political influence and commercial development.

During a century the dominant factors in the expansion into Asia, have been Russia and England; the other Powers, France, Germany and Italy, are secondary and modifying factors. The acuteness of rivalry in the convergency of all those interests, dates from the piercing of the Suez Canal which opened the shortest sea-route from Europe to Asia.

Russia, separated into numerous republics, was in the Middle Ages, the object of the aggression of her neighbours from the northwest, from the west, the south, the southeast and the east. Of these, the eastern, western and northwestern aggressions were the most successful; Poland, Sweden and the Tartars gained foot-holds in Russia and, for a short period, the Russian

sovereignty was practically in abeyance. Reaction against those aggressions and conquests brought the recall from abeyance of Russian sovereignty and the forming of one united Russian State out of the many small republics and principalities. In that creative act of "gathering together of the Russian Earth"— as Russians say, — Moscow was Tzar, and one by one, adding State unto State bound "All the Russias" into one mighty whole. The freeing from Tartar rule and the following up of the receding Mongol into Asia, brought Russia to the boundaries of the Chinese Empire.

In the Eighteenth Century, Russia accomplished moves of expansion in three directions: in the northwest, reaching the Baltic, destroying the power of Sweden, Peter the Great "hacked open his window to the west;"— in the west, "Little" and White" Russia were regained from Poland, and finally, with participation in the partition of Poland, making her borders

contiguous with those of Germany and Austria-Hungary, Russia reached the limits of her expansion westward. In the south, she extended her sway by conquest from Turkey, to the shores of the Black Sea and came to the Caspian. Since the beginning of the Ninteenth Century Russia's lines of advance have borne: southwestward, in the direction of the Eastern Mediterranean and Suez, designated by some writers as her advance along her "right flank." In the East, her advance has been to and along the coast of the Pacific, designated as the "left flank," and the central line of advance in Mid-Asia, has lain southward in the direction of the Indian Ocean by way of Persia and the Persian Gulf.

Russia is, at the same time, European and Asian. Her homogeneity is territorial and, more or less racial, and she possesses the strategic interior lines relative to Europe and Asia. The nations touching Russia's borders are geographically, racially and politically segregated from each

other. For this reason a defeat of Russia, as history has shown, results in increase of Russian strength and expansion.

England following in the wake of the Portuguese, Spaniards, Dutch and French in their colonial expansion, came to India. The wars of the seventeenth and especially of the eighteenth century gave to England the possession of India. India has, in a sense, created the British Empire. Without India, England might be only the United Kingdom with some colonies in the Americas. But India and the protection of India, forced England to acquire Malta, Cyprus and Egypt; to seek the hegemony of the Eastern Mediterranean and its coasts, Suez and the Red Sea; to acquire the Cape of Good Hope, the islands on the West coast of Africa, the islands and coastline on the East coast of Africa; to acquire possessions in the East Indian Archipelago, Burma, Singapore, Hongkong,— to extend her dominion and colo-

nise Australia and New Zealand. Without India, England would not have gone into the Southern Pacific, where, to-day, she watches with keen eyes the developments around and at the Panama Canal.

The Indian Ocean has become a British lake. The entrances to it from all its sides are in British hands.

During the eighteenth century Great Britain and France fought together for empire on all the seas of the world and in all its land-battles, either under their own flags, or by taking a hand in opposed camps in all other wars. France fought England in the American struggle for independence, and England fought France in the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars. France as an empire went under, England triumphed; her trophies were the British Empire and the mastery of the waves.

Those conquests displaced the gravity of the British Empire and removed its

centre from the British Isles to India, whose protection must thenceforth form the first aim of British policy.

Napoleon's Egyptian campaign, in 1798, and his ephemeral alliance with Russia for the conquest of India, pointed out new roads by which India could be attained. From that expedition and the treaty of Tilsit dates the era of which the modern political situation is the result.

India is a continental possession with long land-frontiers. The base of the defences of that frontier are not in India but in England, whence troops and all material of resistance must come. As Lord Beaconsfield said: "The keyes of India lie not at Herat or Kandahar but at Westminster." The distance between England and India is considerable; the road is by sea, the shortest one lies by way of the Mediterranean, Suez and the Red Sea. So Malta, Egypt and Aden defend that road. Every change in the possession of the strategic positions throughout the Near

East is a menace to India. So, the status quo of the Turkish Empire was long considered as a defence; so, the maintenance of Persia and Afghanistan in their status of being under English influence is necessary for the defence of India.

Russian expansion in the direction of the Bosporus, of Persia, in Central Asia, and along the shores of the Pacific in the Far East meant to England a menace to India. To meet Russian advance England expanded the borders of India on the east, west and north, in search of natural frontiers of snowy mountain ranges or waterless deserts, interposing barriers to invasion. She intervened in Persia and in Afghanistan which became her exclusive domain in influence, while Persia has been the region of a constant war of influence between her and Russia; Russia, exercising pressure on the northern land-borders, England, in the south along the coast, through the extension of her Indian bor-

ders over Belutchistan. In Turkey, Russian diplomacy was opposed by British.

The antagonism between England and Russia, the two mightiest realms in the modern age, has, during the past hundred years, dominated the world-situation in all its essential bearings. The groupings of the Powers as they present themselves today are either the direct results of, or have been shaped under the influence of that contest.

The events of the international affairs and politics from the beginning of the nineteenth century to the present time, have been largely moulded by the efforts of Russia towards expansion in either of the three lines of her advance and by the efforts of England to restrain, to repulse and destroy Russia, using every available means of diplomacy of war — supporting the militant forces of other nations whose interests came into clash with those of Russia — or by aiding the interior movements of

discontent aimed at the inner destruction of the Russian State.

On the principle of Turkish territorial integrity, England, as counterpoise to Russian influence, took an active hand in the affairs of the settlement of the Greek wars of independence. When, by the treaty of Adrianople in 1829, closing the Russo-Turkish war, Russia stipulated along with confirmation of her rights to pass the Straits, practical independence under Turkish suzerainty of Moldavia, Valachia, Servia and Greece,— England, France and Austria, as a check to Russia, went a step further and established the complete independence of Greece. England also took the lead in holding up the Sultan's authority against Mehemet Ali, of Egypt, taking out of the hands of Russia the sole protection of the Sultan which had been accorded her by the treaty of Unkiar Skellessi (1833), and by the protocols of London, 1840 and 1841, closing the incident of Mehemet Ali. England not only

baffled French diplomacy, but worsted Russia, forbidding warships the passage of the Dardanelles and Bosporus, so shutting up the Russian fleet in the Black Sea. These protocols, closing the doors of the Mediterranean to Russia who was superseded, in her special advantages of aiding Turkey, by the Powers of Europe,— formed the nucleus of the since famous concert of Europe.

The defeat and utter destruction of the Turkish fleet at Sinope three weeks after the declaration of war by Turkey against Russia in 1853, proving the strength of the Russian fleet in the Black Sea, foreshadowed ultimate complete Turkish destruction and the opening of the Straits to a free entrance of the Russian fleet from the Black Sea into the Mediterranean. England and France as allies, intervened in favour of Turkey and fought the Crimean war, Austria, meanwhile, as an anti-Russian move, occupying Rumania. Russia, defeated in that European conflict, found

herself, by the treaty of Paris, deprived both of the right to possess a naval force in the Black Sea and of the right, recognised to her by the treaty of Kutchuk Kainardji (1774), to protect the Orthodox Christians in Turkey. At that time the Western Powers adopted Turkey into concert of Europe. For these losses the fortunes of Russia compensated her in the Far East, where, being forced to defend the Siberian coast against the military actions of the Franco-English Fleet, Russia was able to foil her adversaries and extend her coast southward, took possession of the Amour province and founded the Fortress of Vladivostok ("Ruler of the East").

During the next decade, England was chiefly occupied with the great Indian mutiny and its effects and her attention was required in other regions removed from the Near East. Russia, too, was fully engaged in the re-organisation of her empire, the final subjection of the Tcherkess tribes in

the Caucasus, steady expansion in Central Asia, and consolidation in the Far East.

In Europe in that period, the first great results of modern nation-making were attained, evolving from the principle of "Nationalities," that is, the State as the corporate embodiment and will of the whole of a race as opposed to the artificial and arbitrary treaty-bond. That bond-of-blood principle found its expression in the wars of 1859, the making of an Italian unified nation in 1861, the Austro-Prussian-Italian war of 1866, and the Franco-German war of 1870-71, which created a German unified nation, changed the conditions of the balance of power in Europe, and resulted in a new grouping of forces into the alliances and ententes into which Europe is split to-day.

The Russo-Turkish war of 1877-78, was undertaken by Russia in the general support of the Christians of the Balkans, aiding Servia and Montenegro, creating Bulgaria, and ending in the Treaty of San

Stephano, which was revised and stultified at the congress of Berlin.

England's opposition to Russia and support of Turkey and Islâm in that war, checking Russia's advance through the Bosporus, but unable to hold her back from gaining a foot-hold on the great strategic position of the Armenian plateau in Asia, off-set by England, to a certain extent, by the convention which gave her Cyprus; non-intervention by Christendom in the Armenian massacres and the obstruction of Russia's design to establish an autonomous Turkish and Persian Armenia, excited Moslem minds.

In the train of the Turkish disaster of 1878, the rising of the Mahdi and Arabi Pasha's revolt in Egypt, were but manifestations of the general dissatisfaction throughout all Islâm against the Ottoman ruler as Khalifa. English anti-Russian policy in Moslem Persia, Moslem Afghanistan, Moslem Mid-Asia and Moslem Turkey, was, in theocratic Moslem eyes, being

pro-Islamic, anti-Christian. Besides, did not England support Islâm everywhere — in Morocco, Tunis, Algiers, as against Spain and France? A sense of solidarity throughout Islâm began to be revived rousing Moslems to arrogant contempt of the Christian Powers. The idea of one great Islamic realm encircling the Moslem world inspired the Afghan ruler Abdur-Rahman with a vast and comprehensive plan for its accomplishment. The execution of such a plan, still to-day un-renounced by his successor in Afghanistan, would be the axe at the root of British rule in India. Abdur-Rahman, in all naïvete submitted this scheme to Queen Victoria expecting the aid of England for Islâm against the Cross. England found it wise to retain the services of the Afghan ruler's clever adviser and councillor and to prevent his return into the council chamber at Cabul. This plan of the union of Islâm took possession of the imagination of Abdul-Hamid and the Turks at Stambul; the delegate of the

Sheikh-El-Senussi became the great power behind the Ottoman throne. From the shores of the Bosporus Pan-Islâm was spread throughout the world.

This new revival of Islâm crystallizing into new political aims, incidentally created a new and grave problem for Great Britain in India. In Central Asia, Russia was not checked by Islâm and was soon the neighbour of British India and Afghanistan and weighed more heavily against Persia. The policy pursued by England to hinder Russian advance failed all along the line: — the strengthening of the Turk and Islâm, the support of the anarchistic element in Russia preparing for a great social upheaval, coupled with lurid press-campaigns and fiction-literature, depicting Russian horrors, with the object of inflaming the sentiment of the whole world against Russia; the policy of making Persia and Afghanistan buffer-States between British and Russian spheres of influence, which involved encouragement of the elements of disorder

and the retarding of national progress in those two countries, as well as the convention between Russia and England forbidding railroad and other construction in Persia. All of these means had proved ineffective of their purpose. Russia was firmly established in Central Asia and two lines of railroad connected the frontiers of Persia and Afghanistan with European Russia across the wastes of Turkestan.

Islâm had become a danger. England's occupation of Egypt gave her the command of Suez and of the Red Sea through effective possession, but Lord Curzon's plans in Arabia which were expected to sever Islâm into hostile camps made slow headway.

The events in the Far East, making of Russia a potential Pacific naval power, with supreme influence in Mongolia, Chinese Turkestan and even in Thibet; the rise of Japan, an Island Power, threatening to become a rival of England, occasioned the plan of an alliance between England and Japan against Russia. Japan

would be crippled; and Russia, defeated or victorious, would find in the Far East a perpetual Japanese question fixing her strength and attention in that quarter of the globe, a condition favourable to a social revolution similar to the French catastrophy at the end of the eighteenth century. However, the logic was at fault which saw analogy between the Russian situation and that of France prior to the revolution. The misleading elements in the situation were failure to rightly appreciate the foundations of the Russo-Japanese differences; the impossibility of lasting or sound alliance between two naval-powers such as England and Japan; the common interests between Russia and Japan in the Far East; and the differences between France and Russia in regard to character and conditions.

The Russian defeat was not crushing, it was a repulse; the Japanese victory did not exhaust Japan as had been expected, but set her up as a real menace to England

and every other power in the Far East and Pacific. The result of the war was, indeed in many of its bearings, a British disaster and also an American defeat. The interior revolution in Russia failed — was a fiasco — even the Duma did not do the work of destruction expected of it, but on the contrary, became an instrument of new national Russian patriotic sentiment. The irresistible outcome of the war after the Peace of Portsmouth was an understanding between Japan and Russia on the basis of their common fundamental interests in the Far East, culminating in the present Russo-Japanese alliance.

Blocked on the left flank by the new position of Japan in the Far East, Russia was thenceforth concentrated in her centre, the Persian border and the Armenian plateau.

The situation, metamorphosed in Europe by the unifications of Germany and Italy, transferred the balance of power into

the hands of the newly created German Empire, which secured its position by a new grouping of powers.

The rapid economic development of Germany, her unprecedented advance in fields of commerce and industry which, up to then, had been considered Great Britain's exclusive preserves; the hardship entailed thereby to English industry and trade; the German colonisation and the results of the International Colonial Conference in 1882, brought about a growing feeling of hostility between the two countries, which found its climax during the British South-African war in the so-called Kruger telegram. British foreign policy, in order, not only to provide against Russia in the impending struggle in the Far East, where Great Britain was supporting Japan by her alliance, but also in the interest of finding in Europe an ally who could supply a militant land force in any eventful struggle with Germany, concluded the entente cordiale with France. The Morocco clauses

of that arrangement gave Germany the pretext to protest. The Algesiras Conference which followed, proved to Great Britain that France without Russia would be useless as an ally, and it became evidently advisable for England to pursue a policy of conciliation towards Russia and to find means of destroying the Triple Alliance.

The move forward of Pan-Islâm, stimulated by the victories of Japan over Russia, was manifested in Egypt, in Turkey, Persia, Afghanistan and in India, where the capacity of the Asiatic to defeat the European, inflamed Hindu imagination and gave rise to grave agitation against British Rule, which agitation became the more dangerous for reason of the Japanese imperialistic policy in regard to Asiatic nations in the Far East.

The growth of German influence in Asiatic Turkey, the Bagdad Railway scheme and concessions, and the accom-

panying German colonisation revealed to England a new Power on the path to India.

The constitutional movement in Persia, the proclamation of a constitution, which it was thought might, to certain extent, be used against Russian influence, met the fate of all constitutions in Moslem lands and the experiment ended in anarchy. A Russo-English agreement to define the spheres of influence became necessary as the sole means of stemming Muscovite intervention in Persia. In the wake of this arrangement came the Russo-German agreement concerning railroad construction in Persia and Asiatic Turkey.

England, in her search for allies in Europe to help her face Germany, nearly succeeded in 1908, in closing the ring around her enemy, and her prospective ally, Austria, was to have been paid with the free road to Salonika. Turkey and Germany defeated the move. The work prepara-

tory for an advance southward was continued by Austria, whose success would have meant not only the crushing of the independent Serb States but in reaching Salonika she would have hemmed in Italy. The understanding discussed between Austria and France in 1908, would have placed Italy between two foes, one in command of the Western, the other in command of the Eastern Mediterranean, and Italy's war against Turkey which was resented by England, France and Austria, arose partly from Italy's necessity to gain a basis on the opposite shores of the Mediterranean, in Tripoli, capable of exercising pressure on French-North-Africa in the West and on Egypt on the East, and also to neutralise an eventual Austrian naval base at Salonika, a port destined to become one of the great commercial and military gateways of the Eastern Mediterranean.

Russia had regained her militant strength. Her alliance with Japan, releasing in all Far Eastern affairs forces ena-

bling her to exercise a greater pressure in Central Asia, was once again a formidable factor in Europe.

It was Russia's good will which allowed Italy to go forward in her war with Turkey and restrained England, France and Austria from taking steps hostile to that campaign.

The Franco-Russian alliance has had the good effect of keeping the peace in Europe. Russian policy has been to restrain France from precipitation in any crisis, and it is due to Russian influence that an amicable settlement has been found possible in all aggravating incidents that have occurred between France and Germany during the last twenty years. As has been said, there exists no real cause of war between Germany and Russia; the cost of war between those two powers would far outweigh any possible gain to either. The only likely cause of war would be in the supposed event of Germany giving military support to Austrian aggression in the Bal-

kan Peninsula, but since the rise of the new Balkan League possessing a million bayonets, any advantages to be gained by Germany in fighting Austria's fight have become of questionable value.

England, to gain Russian alliance, will have to pay a price commensurate with the risks involved. In that connection, an interesting theory was put forward in the Anglo-Russian discussions and, prior to the sudden rise of the new Balkan giant, found much support in England. The suggestion was to boldly give Russia her needed and far-sought warm water-port by allowing her a strip of land to the Persian Gulf. The partisans of that theory believed that with the final attainment of such a port which has formed the object of Russia's ceaseless pursuit for over a hundred years, all danger to India from that Power would vanish; as it has been observed that Russia, in the sole interest of territorial aggrandizement, never seeks the conquest of thickly populated countries, but occupies

only lands that are sparsely inhabited. At the present instant the perplexity occasioned by the sensational advent of the Balkan States as a new and portentous Power has given rapid rise in England to another conception, which, while retaining the old pro-Austrian policy, would recognise German special interests in Asiatic Turkey, where Germany would encounter Russia.

The Austrian proposals to enforce clause XXIII of the Berlin treaty menaced the very existence of the Balkan States and precipitated their alliance and war against Turkey, which ended in the utter Ottoman destruction with capture by the Allies of over two hundred and fifty thousand men, rank and file of the Turkish army with over 1600 pieces of artillery and compelled the ejection of the Turk from Europe. That swift campaign changed the whole character of the Near Eastern Question.

The status quo in the Balkan Peninsula, which was considered by Great Britain to be a necessity for her defence of India and Suez, has not been destroyed, it has merely become stable and passed from the hands of a usurper into those of its rightful guardians, the Allied Balkan States. Should a great Power like Austria gain access to the Peninsula and possession of the central position of the Servian plateau, or be able to turn that position by taking it in the rear, through an Austrian or even Austro-Italian protectorate in Albania, the balance of power represented by the status quo would not only be modified but would be completely disestablished, with the ruinous consequences against which Great Britain has so long and at such a sanguinary price sought to fortify herself. Furthermore, the supposition that the Turks, in the presence of the changes now occurring, can ever again be able to hold the Bosporus and the Dardanelles, is equally a fallacy, based on the difficulty of correctly and in-

stantly gauging the magnitude and portent of those changes.

The Allied States forming the new Balkan Power will henceforth take their place in the Concert of Europe, and have their voice in all those questions of the Near East dealing with the adjustments of the interests in that region of Great Britain, Russia, Germany, Italy, Persia and Turkey.

CHAPTER III

THE FAR EASTERN AND PACIFIC SITUATION

THE Far Eastern and Pacific situation are intimately linked into a single problem, which, from being a race for commercial and colonial expansion in the early nineteenth century, has, with the first years of the new century, become a question, of which the dominating factor is Japan and Japanese interests in conflict with those of various western nations in the course of their trade expansions in that region.

The dynamic elements of that situation are: — the vast agglomeration of buyers called China; the approaches to that still unpre-empted market of supposedly unlimited absorptive capacity; the exigencies of national defence imposed upon Japan

by her geographical conditions; and her necessity of securing her position against any pressure which the west could bring to bear to force the subordination of her own vital economic interests to those of other nations.

CHINA, where the interests of all nations converge, is composite of peoples related racially, but dissimilar in tongue and mentality. A State-formation several thousand years old,— a structure of family, society and State, based on an ethical and philosophical principle, which has, during the many centuries moulded the whole life into an appearance of uniformity, giving the illusion of a single organism of fixed and regular functions.

China is awakening; "new China," is an expression heard on all sides. Inspired by the spectacle of the swift re-organisation of Japan in adapting her interior life to new conditions, expectations draw parallels between that country and China,

but there are no true grounds for such comparisons. Japan, even old Japan, always possessed a social and State-organisation embodying a continuity of national ideal, which, in efficient formulation of purpose, bore analogy with the western State organisations. Such embodiment of national conception has never existed in China. There is no basis for accomplishing in China what has been accomplished in Japan, whatever form of organisation may finally be evolved from the static chaos in China.

Japan had its national traditions, its feudal and strong military organisations, it was never submitted to foreign rule. The ideal was essentially Japan for the Japanese. This assertion of the idea of national entity and national genius, which in turn, expressed itself in the social hierarchy, ranking the soldier, the agriculturer and the artist above all other classes, that is, the defender and the creator, above the middle-man and exploiter, caused Japan to

evolve in the interest of those ideals. The material means and the outer forms changed, but New Japan remained Old Japan at heart.

Not so with China, whose hierarchy was, first, the littérateur — maker of poems and classical annotator — then, the agriculturer, the artisan, the merchant, and last of all, the soldier.

The soul of Japan was a sword; — the soul of China, seemingly, literary sophism, paper-facsimile — in reality a force unsheathed.

The mentality of the Chinese people is best discovered in its philosophic system, that of Confucius, reaching deep down into the racial temperament. This creed can be summed up in three articles of belief: — the sacredness of the family institutions, ancestor-worship, dependent upon the first, and third, of the paramount duty of labour. For thousands of years the Chinese have

only asked from their rulers the right to live and labour peaceably within the limits of that creed. China, during the several thousand years of her history, has passed through many convulsions being often split into several States, or united into one, falling almost indifferently, under native or foreign governance. The people lived their rulers down. So long as they were able to labour and live and their customs and ideas were not violently interfered with, the constituted Government received the respect and obedience of the masses. But any public disaster, of flood or famine, was taken as a sign that the ancestral throng were not properly propitiated by the rulers, against whom it became the peoples' duty to revolt, in obedience to the heavenly displeasure. These movements proceeding in reality from economic grievances were not political but superstitional.

Meadows, one of the greatest authorities on China, said about sixty years ago, " The Chinese are the most rebellious and

the least revolutionary people on earth." Always ready to rebel, no race responds so quickly as they to good government.

A Chinese proverb says:—"The Yellow River may change its bed, but its waters will remain as muddy as before."

The immediate assimilation of western ideas, imported into China by a handful of Chinese educated abroad, cannot be expected, any more than that a paper-constitution, substituting a republic for a monarchy, should over night, by the mere fact of its proclamation, do away with vice, and graft ("squeeze"), give higher wages, abolish starvation and make the poor man rich. As if a savage from the Congo, by donning an evening suit, a white shirt front and a silk hat, should by reason of that apparel, become at once, a civilised being.

Changes, proposing to alter the whole nature and traditions of a nation extending back for centuries and tens of centuries, and to up-root all the ethics and philosophy of a race, cannot be accomplished in the

short space of a few years or even a few generations. However, with a rapidity hitherto unshown in the world's history the Chinese have adopted in sudden and stupendous proportion, contrivances of western civilisation. Whether those contrivances will breed western ideals and acceptations, remains for a remoter future to prove.

China has a problem of increasing population, which hitherto, has been largely regulated during the centuries by constantly recurring famines, pestilences and revolts, but with the adoption of sanitary and hygienic conditions resulting in the conservation of human lives coupled with the introduction of labour-saving devices, this question must become formidable; such conditions, yielding overwhelming tides of human material for industrial slavery must affect the economic destinies of other countries.

To these conditions which cannot fail to enter into the calculations of the foreign

countries interested in China, must be added the further Chinese characteristics which have made it possible throughout the centuries for foreign rulers to enter China, sieze the Vermillion pencil and impose rule upon the multitude of millions without much opposition, and for the recent revolution to be achieved by a few western students in regard to whose movements the masses remained apathetic. This state of public indifference as to the personality of the ruler or the type of government is further illustrated by the Vice-president of the new republic in China who advised the President Yuan-Shi-Kai to sieze the Dragon-throne, proclaim himself Emperor of China and so end the anarchy and difficulties which had resulted from the revolt. The opinion is widely expressed among men who have taken part in the overthrow of the Manchus, that a western form of republican government is unsuited to the needs and contrary to the traditions of the Chinese people.

The republican party is pulled between one or another of the systems expounded by the few students who had been educated in western Universities, and the unyielding principles of Confucian ethics. Confucianism, in sum, exemplifies another though paradoxical view of democratic principles, its system of administration being based on learning and examination yet with one central absolute head: self-government and autocracy in one. Herein lies, perhaps, the explanation why so little has been done in the direction of constitution building. The tendency appears to be towards the final triumph of the moderate reformers whose number daily increases, and whose ideal is a constitutional monarchy on foundations built upon the old Chinese traditions. This group is violently opposed by the reformers from Canton, who are determined to out-Japanese the Japanese in the westernization of China.

It is the Cantonese, the Chinamen of

Map of the Far East

the south, who are the moving spirits, possessing free impulse and the organizing mind. The population of central and northern China are a passive race, ready to recognise a conqueror, and the northern and central parts of China are quite different in characteristics: socially, racially and politically, from the southern provinces.

The great Taiping rebellion, which lasted for more than twenty years, was under Cantonese direction, and, back of all pretexts and provocations, its real causes were dissatisfaction with economic conditions.

The collapse of the Manchu dynasty, the so-called "revolution," was in part, a movement directed from Canton, and, in the opinion of many observers, may conceivably end in the separation of these southern provinces from the rest of China.

In this connection, it may be useful to remember that in the earlier periods up to the twelfth century, there existed two

empires in the great alluvial plains of the two great rivers, the Hoangho and the Yangtze-Kiang; one in the north around Peking as capital, more tartaric, called the Empire of the Kin, and in the south, the pure Chinese realm of the Song, with Hankow as centre. Tchinghiz Khan and his successors united into one all the Chinese and Mongol lands, but were overthrown by a pure Chinese reaction under the lead of the Ming,— the dynasty which from 1368, up to 1644 occupied the throne of the "Son of Heaven," first in the southern capital of Nanking and then in Peking in the north. In 1644 they were replaced by conquest by the Tsing dynasty, rulers of Manchuria, Manchu Tartars and descendants of the former Tartaric rulers of the Empire of the Hoang-ho or the Kin. To-day, the Chinese revolt, having its centre in the south is, likewise, a reaction against the Tartaric conqueror.

Under the dynasty of the Tsing, so long as those rulers could still count on the sup-

port of their war-like Manchu-clansmen, the Chinese Empire formed one great unit and attained its apogee of power extending its rule far out over Mongolia, Tibet, Turkestan and south into Anam and Cambodga — a realm to-day in process of dissolution.

The States which had been subjugated like Mongolia, Turkestan, Tibet, Anam, forming a ring around China proper, enclosing the two Chinas, north and south, began slowly, during this last century with the first real contact between the West and China, to fall away from the Chinese Empire,— Anam is to-day a French colony. Manchuria, a possession of the Tsing dynasty and not of China, is to-day half in Russian, half in Japanese hands. Mongolia and Turkestan declared their independence from the rule of the Tsing, when that dynasty was dethroned and abdicated its rule over China, and both Mongolia and Turkestan, countries rich in good farm soil but sparsely populated, have asked

protection from their stronger neighbour, Russia. Tibet is doing the same, falling under Anglo-Indian guardianship.

The reaction against the Tsing or Manchu dynasty took many forms of revolt known under different names to the outside world, but they were rooted all more or less, in the same grievances; — so long as the Tartar or Manchu clansmen, who in their eight Banners, as the descendants of the conquerors of China in the seventeenth century, were distributed through the empire in form of garrisons, or military colonies, received tribute, and had many privileges which distinguished them and put them above the Chinese, so long as those men were a militant force, the reaction against the Manchu rule in the different revolts were easily suppressed; but with the falling off of that Tartar military support, while the grievances still subsisted, there was no force to impose the recognition of those old privileges and the collapse of the rule of the Manchus was the result.

The powerlessness of the Chinese throne at Peking to suppress the revolt of the Taiping without European aid, gave evidence of the decay of the Manchu power and of the deterioration of the forces upon which that foreign rule had relied to impose itself upon China. This fact was finally recognised by the Throne itself, when the unfortunate Emperor Kwang-Shu, in 1898, outlined his famous reform edict, which is in line with the constructive policy outlined by Yuan-Shi-Kai in November, 1911.

Had the Manchu dynasty been capable of achieving those reforms, removing the grievances which galled the Chinese most, they might have maintained their sway, especially as there was no deep or violently formulated resentment against them in the masses of the people; they might, by degrees have reconstructed the administration with representative government and parliament on bases in harmony with Chinese customary philosophic thought and conceptions.

China came first into contact with the Occident in the time when Alexander the Great made his conquests in Asia, and the Macedonian Empire stretched itself up to the Plateau of the Roof of the World and the sources of the Tarim River. Greek merchants brought the silks of China to the west and Greek and Persian influences penetrated the Flowery Kingdom and left their traces in the Chinese art. That intercourse was interrupted when Eastern Asia became the centre of those vast mongolic convulsions of conquests which hurled their hordes into China as well as into the Occident, and shattered Rome, indirectly causing the fall, first of the western, and finally of the eastern Roman Empire, which were forced by the new-comers to give place to other formations.

When the Turk, a product of eastern Asia, where, still to-day, his brother Turk lives as nomad, took Constantinople and blocked the road for the caravans from the Occident to China and other parts of

the Far Orient, and new roads were found to the Indies and the East, the Portuguese, the discoverers of those new pathways, were the first to found a factory on Chinese territory, as they were the first Europeans, since the Venetian Marco Polo, to step on Chinese soil. The Spaniards followed the watery track eastwards. The Dutch in turn, freed from Spanish Hapsburg, went to wrest the rule of the Oceans from Portuguese and Spaniard, occupied the East Indian Archipelago and Formosa, and asserted themselves there against Japan and Spain, and found themselves in touch with the struggle in China, between Mink and Manchu conqueror. Formosa became Chinese, first taken by the Ming, who, in turn, were vanquished by the Manchu. Those were the days when the Manchu Tartars from Manchuria submitted China to their rule, when the Portuguese and the Dutch knocked gently on the Sea doors of China, while the wild Cossack-leader of the Russian advance harshly made his presence

known in the north to the new Son of Heaven, the ruler of Manchuria.

Soon in the seventeenth century, France and England opened their trading stations in the Far East, the missionary, the advance man of foreign intrusion into any country dubbed barbaric or semi-barbaric — but good as colony or market — entered China and Japan. In Japan, this rôle of the missionary, who, unconsciously doubles his usefulness beyond his conscious aim, was soon perceived, and finding pretext in the fight between Jesuits and Franciscans, between Catholics and Protestants,[1] the candid answer of the Spanish mariner to the Shogun became the signal for hostility towards all foreigners. Japan was closed to the West and remained so into the middle of the nineteenth century.

In China, at the end of the eighteenth century synchronising with the great French upheaval in Europe after the death

[1] "First comes the missionary, then the merchant and the soldier."

of the last strong Emperor, the weakness of the Manchus became first apparent. The signs of a loosened grip emboldened the many secret societies like the "White Lily," the "Triads," etc., which had been founded several centuries earlier under the reigns of the Ming dynasty, as mutual aid associations, but which, under the Manchu rule, became centres of southern reaction against the Mongol. Under the rallying formula of "Ming-shin" or "Ming-chao" expressions of double meaning "rule of light" or rule of the "Ming" — it was again the case of the south against the north and in the last decades of the eighteenth and the first nineteenth centuries, these societies fomented extensive revolts, even for a moment capturing the Imperial residence at Peking.

Suppressed by a stern hand outwardly, these societies survived as the protectors of the local interests of pirates and land-robbers in the southern provinces. From that time on, the whole revolt had assumed

more or less the character of piracy, organised looting and robbing. During the nineteenth century, piracy and robbery became an organised status in southern China, a means of livelihood, a chronic expression of general malcontent, fostered and kept up by the over-crowding of population forming veritable ant-hills of half-starved peoples, and lack of common honesty in all departments of public life under the fee system of remuneration of public service. The interior difficulties of the Chinese central government of the Manchu rulers were increased by the so-called Opium war with Great Britain in 1839 and 1841-2. Powerless to prevent the clandestine sale of Indian opium, for smoking, which was smuggled into China, the Chinese authorities, in June, 1839, seized 20,000 opium cases from India, which were ready to be smuggled into Canton and threw them into the sea. A British fleet intervened in favour of the smuggling merchants, who were English, and block-

aded Canton, Amoy and Shanghai. Finally the Chinese Government in its weakness, was forced to submit, and the famous convention of Nanking was signed, admitting the Indian opium, and opening several ports for British trade in China. The privileges secured in the convention of Nanking by England were soon extended to the other western commercial Powers. The West was in firm contact with China.

This encroachment was resented by the natives and in 1850, Hung-Siutsen, of the Clan of Hung in the Province of Canton, started a revolt against the Manchu, called the "Tai-ping"—"the Great Peace." The revolt, essentially anti-foreign, bore also some tinges of reform and was also supposed to involve some interests of the Christian religion in China. The movement rapidly gained all of the southern provinces, crossed the Hoang-ho and Yangtze-kiang, reached up to the very doors of Peking. In 1853 Hung, as the head of the rebellion, established his head-

quarters at Nanking, the old Capital of the south.[1]

Simultaneous with the revolt of the Tai-ping, the Musulmen in China, living in the Yunan, Sze-Tchuen and Shensi, revolted and founded a Mahomedan State with centre at Tali-fu. The Imperial Government at Peking was powerless to subdue the one or the other. The interference of the rebels with the foreigners who had come to China, gave occasion for active intervention from the West, and France and England landed troops in China. The treaty of Tien-Tzien, which ended that war in 1860, gave further trading rights to the western nations. Russia also profited by those interior troubles, and by the treaties of Aigun in 1858, and of Peking

[1] A characteristic of the Tai-ping rebellion was the giving up of the pig-tail. The pig-tail, being a fashion imposed by the Manchus on the Chinese who wore their hair long and loose, until they were brought to submission, when their locks had again to be braided into a cue; in this latest revolution they have taken the precaution to crop it close to the head.

in 1860, was recognised by China as the possessor of the Amour territory and the coast-line up to the Oussouri River where Russia founded Vladivostok. France obtained China's consent to occupy Cambodge and Cochinchina, England gained Hongkong, and a Franco-Anglo-Chinese corps, under "Chinese" Gordon, undertook the suppression of the Tai-ping rebellion. Slowly France, from Cochinchina, worked her way up penetrating far through Annam and Tonking, till she bordered China proper, touching the province of Yunan. England progressed also from the south, occupying Burma, and other points till she reached Tibet on one side, and China proper on the other. Russia, in the west, aproached Chinese Turkestan and enlarged her influence in Mongolia.

In China proper, the Manchu rule had in fact, already collapsed with the beginning of the Tai-ping revolt. That rebellion with its enormous loss of life and the ensuing famines more destructive still,

cleared, for the moment, the pressing overcrowding of the population and, as in the case of former Chinese uprisings, the revolt took the form of organised piracy and robbery under the protection of the secret benevolent aid societies.

The year 1894 can be considered as the turning point of a new period in Far Eastern conditions. Japan, which had been opened to the outside world by an American squadron, and afterwards was menaced in the north by a Russian fleet, perceiving danger to Japanese exclusiveness from the West, began under the leadership of her Emperor to reform, and undertook to assert her own power and position in the Far East. By the year 1894, Japan, prepared for the task she had set for herself by twenty years of work, re-organisation and adaptations of western methods and western arms of defence and offence, came into conflict with China over the suzerainty over Korea. In the ensuing war the Men of Nippon were the victors; they had tested

that instrument which had been formed to assert not only their independence but their dominance in that quarter of the world.

The defeat by Japan had its reverberation in China, the lead in putting forth the idea of reform and consolidation to strengthen that crumbling old building to hold the advanced spirits, came again from the south. The " friends " of China in the Occident who came forward to save the Celestial Empire from Japan's grip, demanded heavy payments for their services in the form of all kinds of railroad and other concessions and territorial positions. Signs of unrest became greater in China, a society was founded by Li-Ping-Heng called the I-Ho-Thuen and I-Ho-Tuan, the volunteer patriotic movement. Some Englishman who saw the Chinese gymnastic exercises and drills, gave them the name of " Boxer." The idea was somewhat akin to that of the German " Turn-vater," Jahn, preparing young Germany for the wars of liberation in 1813-14. The " Triad "

(benevolent society) in Canton also attempted to rise again. The Emperor Hwang-Shu, in 1898, following the counsel of some of the more progressive men, proclaimed the famous edict of reforms. Intrigues in the palace, discontent, in general, and the Boxers or I-Ho-Tuan began under the lead of General Tung-fu-tziang a general anti-foreign movement. The Court of Peking itself was divided. The Foreign Legations were summoned to leave Peking within 24 hours at expiration of which, China would declare war against the foreign troops landed from the fleet at Tien-tzin. That movement was crushed, the Japanese, the Russians, and afterwards, all other nations, sent troops and Peking was taken. Russia occupied Manchuria; and from that time the industrial nations of the West have been in more bold and open competition for China as the great world market, and demanded the "open door" of equal opportunity for everybody.

Japan took advantage of that policy of the "open door," the prevailing antagonism between Great Britain and Russia, and the anti-Russian campaign in the press of the English-speaking peoples, to obtain the aid of the Anglo-Saxons in the execution of her own plans of expansion. The countries of the west, blinded by those antagonisms and influences, and believing in the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon over the Yellow Japanese, who, as was thought, would never be able to emancipate himself from the benevolent tutelage of the English-speaking peoples, and who, after fighting with Russia, would have more than ever need of Anglo-Saxon support, gave Japan all the assistance required for a war with Russia. The aftermath of the victory did not find the Japanese in mood to recognise that benevolence to the disadvantage of its own economic interests and the open door in Manchuria became de facto an empty expression; furthermore, the recent adversaries disconcerted both their ill-

wishers and well-wishers, by an alliance inspired by the recognition that eternal enmity would be paralysing to both. Russia had been brought to admit that her experiment in the Pacific would have never made her a great Pacific Power but would have displaced to a great extent her natural trend of gravity. Japan, too, saw that both have common interests in that part of the world, which are by nature contrary to the economic interests of the western nations, and that her most vital considerations must henceforth concern events in the Pacific Ocean and China, bearing on the conflict of foreign ambitions in that realm, and the destiny of those provinces which, through the Manchu dynasty, had possessed a personal link with China.

The West, especially the United States, has taken an interest in the revolt by Young China and the collapse of the Manchu. The West looks forward to the markets and commercial advantages of a reorganised Young China, whose reorganisa-

tion based on the "open door"— they support as means of contesting Japanese and Russian designs and pretensions.

The mass of the Chinese people are inert, an "inert mass" as Prince Ito said, a slow-thinking and slow-moving mass of agricultural people, born and bred in ancestor worship and patriarchal theism, regarding the Emperor as the Heaven-appointed centre, the crown of their family system, who at seed and harvest time, at flood and famine time, is the invoker of good and the averter of evil. Against that belief, the fundamental truth for that people during more than two thousand years, is the reform movement led by the leader of the radical T'ung Meng Hui, Dr. Sun Yat Sen, who, with his club of young men educated in Europe, heads that society and also the newly-formed Kus-Ming-tong, whose doctrine is to relegate to the region of philosophical curiosity the old wisdoms of Confucius and Mencius, putting in their stead, as bases of practical

politics, the theories of Jean Jacques Rousseau and Mill, so replacing China's old social status of the "Three relations," by unfettered individualism.

What these clashing forces will bring forth only the future can show. The Cantonese call for a China for the Cantonese, in this regard we must not forget the objection which the land of the Ho has against the land of the Kiang. Even if the Cantonese should succeed and establish a rule in Canton, it is more than probable that the conditions of that republic would ressemble conditions in the China-town of the United States cities — a perpetual strife of factions — a war of tongs.

The Chinese are a people averse in principle to all finality; as can be seen in the case of the Emperor whose Imperial title still exists; he has merely retired, and enjoys the homage of courtesy, only, instead of that of fealty.

Out of that chaos a man of destiny ought to appear, by the axiom that great histori-

cal necessities have always ready the man for the event. The army has come into conflict of divergency of view with Young China and become uncontrollable. A military league, similar to that in Turkey, is already in existence. The President, Yuan Shi Kai, finds difficulty in exercising the executive function; signs are not absent of a sturdy reaction which would restore the ancient ways, the vital Confucian morality and old social structure at whose apex is the Dragon Throne. But a good harvest has proved the best conciliator, and the people, less rebellious, are prone to cease from troubling about reforms and "Young China."

Whether or not the man of destiny appear, Young China will not have been in vain. Whatever be the outcome, the dominant factor for the outside world, the factor which will determine the conditions of the balance of power in the Far East, is Japan, aided by her natural ally, Russia.

JAPAN, an island State, which alone of all the countries of Asia, has never been submitted to conquest, was, after a seclusion of over two centuries, open to foreign trade. First, an American, and then a Russian fleet, made Japan understand that her independence might be in danger. From that time forth all Japanese effort was aimed at the defence of her independence. Both her interior policy of re-organisation and her foreign policy has as guiding principle the constant assertion of that independence.

In the school of the West, she soon learned that her geographic position is similar to that of Great Britain and that the maxims which history has proved to be true in the case of the Island State in the Atlantic must be true for her.

So long as England neglected to perceive the truth that the borders of an Island State are not the shores of her own islands, but the opposite coasts of the lands bordering the sea in the midst of which she

is situated, so long was England subjected to foreign conquest, or menace of conquest. Cromwell first formulated that perception into a definite policy of naval supremacy. The failure of his successors, the Stuart Kings, to understand his work and continue it allowed Dutch William to land and take possession of England. But William, as a Hollander, knew the meaning of the Sea and from that time on, that military and political principle was recognised in England.

The spectacle to-day of the tension between Germany and England and their competition in naval construction, evidence England's grim consciousness that she must be ready for the test of that naval supremacy which not only gives her immunity from menace of conquest, but makes Great Britain that great world power she still is.

In following the history of modern Japan, its tendencies are clearly laid out and conditioned by that same fixed axiom which in any consideration of Japan can

with profit be repeated, namely, that the independence of an island, and its immunity from conquest, lies not in the defence of its coasts alone, but in the recognition that the borders of it are the shores which delimit the sea or the ocean in the midst of which lies that Island State. The means to enforce this principle lies in the control of that ocean or sea, backed by a strong land-force.

That principle dictates to England her necessity of closely watching the political developments of the continental States, and where opportune, of taking a modifying hand in their affairs, of being able to turn the scales in a given situation, and of not permitting any one power to become strong enough to remain unaffected by any coalition which would include Great Britain.

Japan must follow a similar policy on the Eastern part of the Eurasian continent. Without adequate naval and military equipment, Japan would be unable to use in its

fulness her exceptional position in that third of the globe.

During the period of her seclusion, Japan had more or less neglected the islands which in former days had been part of her empire, or had submitted to her influence; she had also neglected Korea, that peninsula which, protruding from the Asiatic continent, forms a kind of advance or menace to herself.

When Japan was ready, having re-organised her interior, and created a navy and an army on the best approved European style, she took stock of the outer situation and conditions around her.

In the north lay the island of Sakhalin, which she had been forced to cede to Russia, and Russia was also in possession of parts of the Asian shores in the northwest. Korea, the old bone of contention between China and Japan, was under Chinese suzerainty and was fast becoming a Chinese province. China, herself, owning the

Asiatic shores opposite Japan, appeared to be modernising and developing an army and navy, which could use Korea as base. In the south, Japan's ocean washed the Philippines and the shores of the East Indian Archipelago, through whose narrow channels it communicated with the Indian Ocean. In the east, Japanese waters were limited by the shores of the American continent, some 6000 miles away, their expanse broken only by the great half-way house of the ocean, the Hawaii. The Philippines were in Spanish hands, the East Indian Archipelago in Dutch and English hands, Hawaii was a Republic, Russia held the north.

The line of least complication and therefore of least resistance, was in the direction of China, which, by its suzerainty over Korea, was in nearest touch with Japan. It was also the weakest power, military and naval. Beyond these considerations, China had been proclaimed to be the great

future market by the western nations; Japan had entered the way of industrialism and her increasing population needed an outlet.

The question over Korea between Japan and China — a very old question of dispute — became the reason for the Chino-Japanese war of 1894. The Japanese army and navy showed their capacity and demonstrated that Japan was on the right road to assert herself and demand from the West recognition of her power and a commensurate position in the world.

The European powers intervened in China's favour, receiving from China something in return, and frustrated Japan in the conditions she endeavoured to obtain by the treaty of Shimonoseki, imposed by her on China. Russia formed the apex of that coalition of western powers, she was near at hand and could bring pressure on Japan — who acquiesced. China, henceforth out of the field, the attention of Nippon was drawn to the menace which

came to her from Russia, that power which by its proximity was able to enforce the dictates of the West.

Soon afterward, the Hispano-American war changed the naval situation in the Pacific. The United States took possession of the Philippines and at the same time annexed the Hawaii Islands, as a link between the shores of the American continent and the advanced position of the Philippines. That annexation met with protest from the Japanese Government.

The Boxer-troubles in China, which allowed Russia to occupy Manchuria, brought the fact nearer home to Japan, that since the treaty of Shimonoseki, Russia was at Port Arthur, and Russian influence was strong in Korea. The danger was greater from Russia than from the United States.

Russia and England, the two most important powers in the Far East, were in antagonism; France, although in alliance with Russia, did not count for much in the Far East, because of her peculiar Euro-

pean situation and was neutralised also, by Great Britain's holding the roads to that part of the world.

In this situation Japan held the balance of power. There were no common interests between England and Japan, both being naval powers by fiat of nature. England's possessions and colonial coast-line in the Pacific made her a latent contestant of Japan's necessary aims in the Pacific and elsewhere. Russia was the land-power, with naval ambitions, but top-heavy because of those ambitions, which pitched her eastward beyond her natural line of gravity. The United States were looming up as the Pacific power, having already in preceding years acquired the principal positions giving her that supremacy. For her expansion and defence, Japan stood in need of a land-power ally such as either China or Russia. China was out of count and Russia did not then perceive that the alliance offered her by Japan would be of advantage in regard to her vital interests. To parry

the danger of an understanding between Russia and Japan, though there was no likelihood of it because of Russia's lack of far-seeing statesmen, England made advances to Japan, resulting in the Anglo-Japanese Alliance. But English statesmen, underestimating Japan, as had the Moscovite, believed that a Russo-Japanese war would weaken both powers and create between them a lasting hostility, such as to preclude any mutual understanding between them in the future, and render remote the rise of Japan as a great naval power. In the United States the question of trade expansion, symbolized by that doctrine of the "open door," also ranged her on the side of Japan, trusting, with something of the faith of a young and enthusiastic schoolboy, in the generous championship of American commercial interests by Japan, who was evidently expected to relegate her own economic interests to a second plan.

The victory gave far more trophy to Japan than it took from Russia, whose re-

pulse was mitigated with the gaining of very real advantages. Her land-army, though forced back by the Japanese was never thoroughly defeated, while the sea-disaster to the Russian fleet, which made Japan the great dominating Sea Power of the Far East, concentrated Russia where most her interests lay, and with the conclusion of the war, she recognised her interests in that part of the world to be identical with those of her former foe.

The treaty of Portsmouth opened the way for the logical Russo-Japanese Alliance.

Japan renewed her alliance with England, thus preventing England from entering into alliance with any other power, a move which was eagerly reciprocated from the English side, which feared that the treaty of Portsmouth might be directly followed by a Russo-Japanese, anti-English treaty. Subsequently the Russo-Japanese treaty became a reality.

By the treaty of Portsmouth, Japan re-

ceived control of Korea and the southern part of Manchuria, where she now possesses a market for her products, a market that does not consider the possibility of an open door.

The position of both Russia and Japan in regard to China is the same, a position similar to that which England and France occupied in regard to Germany before 1866 and 1870. One, the land-power, the other the sea-power, both menaced by a third, which in the one case, was an agglomeration of States forming a mere geographical expression, as in the other, that third is a chaos suffering from over-population, misrule and corruption. As the erection of German unity and power was, de facto, disastrous for France and England, so, a re-organised, strong and militant China would be a perpetual menace to both Japan and Eastern Russia — politically and economically.

Both have in that regard, the same policy to pursue, that is, to exercise dominating

influence in the interior affairs of the country, to guide its economic or other development, to exclude so far as possible all other nations from using China as a lever and aid against themselves, and to prevent the peaceful penetration into their own dominions of the Chinese, who, by huge immigrations, could overwhelm their lands or the territories which they have outlined as being fields of expansion for their own peoples. So must Japan and Russia consider as a natural adversary every other nation who would undertake to dominate in China.

The fall of the Manchu dynasty has freed from Chinese rule those States, Mongolia, Eastern Turkestan, Tibet and Manchuria which were bound within the Celestial Empire only by their allegiance to the person of the Manchu Emperor. So it is in pursuance of this policy, that Japan and Russia extend their protection over these States, giving their third partner, England, the same facilities in Tibet,

and, by arrangement with the local self-governing bodies, as Russia does in Mongolia, or simply by ordinance, as Japan is doing in South Manchuria, they take measures to prevent those large influxes which immigrate from China as soon as thriving conditions are established in surrounding territories. Those protectorates are clearly destined to become integral parts of dependencies of Russia, Japan and England.

The European nations recognise that Japan has become the paramount power in the Far East; France has made an arrangement with Japan; England, with the renewal of her alliance in 1911, tacitly acknowledged Japan's hegemony in those regions, and by this alliance, safeguarded her Indian and Indo-Chinese possessions.

That situation in the Far East might be modified to some extent should Holland, which possesses the East Indian Archipelago, enter into a close alliance or confeder-

ation with Germany. These islands which command the entrances from the Indian Ocean to the Pacific and the Chinese littoral would, by the fact of Germany's military and naval power, become a great position in any move to check Japan's predominance over China. The most important position in that archipelago is held by the Philippine Islands, in the hand of the United States. They occupy, what one might term, an offensive advance position in regard to the Chinese coast, of which they control the southern part.

The Monroe doctrine and the defences of the United States' shores, the shores included within the limits set by that doctrine, the western and eastern shores of both Americas, and the island character of that land, demand that the United States do not consider the shores of the Americas as the limits but that the limits of the dominion comprised by that doctrine are the shores of the continents to the east and west, imposing upon the United States the

necessity of controlling the Atlantic in the east and the Pacific in the west. That control is the conditio sine qua non of the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine.

With the triumph of that doctrine, through the Spanish-American war, the acquisition of the Philippines and the Hawaii Islands, became a strategic necessity. This necessity forced the United States to take a great interest in the balance of power in the Far East, made them the champion of the "open door" in China, and led them to seek a combination of powers able to counter-balance the militant forces of Russia and Japan. The same misconceptions as those influencing Great Britain caused the United States to support Japan against Russia. The further move to enforce Japan's promise of the "open door" in Manchuria, and the famous proposal for internationalising the railroads in Manchuria had the effect of driving both States to a more rapid recognition of their mutual and common

interests and hastened the conclusion of the Russo-Japanese Alliance.

That alliance enables Japan to now consider the enunciation of an exclusion doctrine for Eastern Asia similar to the Monroe doctrine for the Americas.

In that connection the Philippines are fast assuming a position relative to the Japanese Islands, similar to that occupied by Korea before the Russo-Japanese war.

Japan's industries claim the markets of the Far East as peculiarly their own. They cannot, and most likely will not, even in the future, be able to compete with English and American or German merchandise under a régime of the open door — ergo, the advisability of closing the door.

The Philippines,— to a country, master of sufficient land and sea power to fully profit by the advantages they bestow — is the position from which the " open door " policy can be enforced.

The Hawaii Islands, the great midway naval base and coaling station, are neces-

sary to the United States for the enforcement of her Monroe doctrine and for the defence of her own territory against encroachment from the Asiatic side, the Philippines in that regard being an advance post only.

The Philippines are, in foreign hands, a menace to the Japanese doctrine of exclusion in the Far East, but their possession, with Hawaii, would make Japan invulnerable against attack, on condition always, that her militant forces were such as to be able to use those positions.

The adjustment of these divergent interests is destined to test to the uttermost the relative forces — militant and diplomatic, of the Powers on the opposed sides of the Pacific Ocean.

CHAPTER IV

THE AMERICAN PROBLEMS

THE American naval strategist, Admiral Mahan, says in his book on Naval Strategy, (1911), page 103:— "By a curious irony the Spanish war which led to the triumph of the Monroe doctrine, by the same stroke brought the United States into the concerns of the European family of nations to a degree never anticipated by our ancestors."

The Monroe doctrine is that principle of American policy which proclaims non-interference by any non-American State in the affairs of either the northern or southern American Continent, and that no part of either of those Continents shall pass from the nations at present possessing it into the hands of non-American nations.

The main approaches of the United States being by sea, that continent has the relative character of an island, which imposes upon it the same basic policies in its foreign relations as those which the geographical conditions impose upon the island-positions of Great Britain and Japan.

The Monroe doctrine consciously or unconsciously was a recognition of that island character. So must the United States also apply the axiom: — that the independence of an island-State, its immunity from conquest lies not in the defence of its coasts alone but in the recognition that the borders of it are the shores which delimit the sea or ocean in the midst of which lies that island Power.

As the Monroe doctrine brings the United States into the concerns of the European family of nations, so its defence brought that country to desire the balance of powers in the Far East, and emphasised the necessity of American control of the Pacific Ocean. The events affecting the

balance of powers in Europe are equally a matter of concern to America, not necessarily an interest in any particular group or changes of combinations, but only, that there shall be equilibrium. The fact that Africa is entirely laid out as a field of colonial expansion and its various regions the subject of contest between the European Powers, caused the United States under the necessity of carefully watching the shifting of political weights and measures among them to take part in the conferences dealing with the problems of African colonisation.

The United States conceived and enounced the Monroe doctrine to avoid being drawn by the nearness of the borders of European States into their tangle of conflicting politics. It was to avoid war and to prevent European intermeddling in American affairs.

From having at its inception aimed only at defence, it grew with American develop-

ment to be an expression of Imperialism, especially in regard to the American continents.

This doctrine was born of the situation at the close of the wars of American Independence, including that of 1812, and the formation of an American State and national unit, and the conditions resulting from the European wars of the Napoleonic period, affecting Spain's relations with her American colonies, and the absolutely dominant position which England had gained and which had given her not only political supremacy in European and world's affairs, but had made her the manufacturer, the carrier on the oceans and seas and the Merchant of the world.

The revolt of the Spanish colonies in Central and South America and their declaration of independence suited Great Britain well, as they became henceforth the clients of England, their great natural riches fell per se into the scope of English trade and carrying monopoly, which

by the re-establishment of Spanish rule in those lands would have been diminished, by reason of the Spanish tariff-wall and Spanish trading monopolies. All that England had gained and for which she had striven during centuries, expending millions of pounds sterling in subsidies during the Napoleonic and Revolutionary wars to the various governments of Europe to finance their armies against France would have been undone.

It must not be forgotten that during the eighteenth century Spain was the constant ally of France against England, and England strove with Spain for the Spanish markets and colonial privileges which she finally obtained when the Spanish colonies declared their independence. Every one of the liberators of South and Central America found his banker in London, and English mercenary troops were to be found on the battle-fields of Mexico, Chile, Argentine, Colombia, Peru, Venezuela, etc.

The decisions of the European Governments, to enforce by militant power the submission of those revolted colonies, was not to the taste nor the interest of the British Cabinet but conditions in Europe did not allow Great Britain to openly take action in the matter. Furthermore, prior to the battle of Austerlitz, the British Government considered that France's defeat would give Great Britain the opportunity to regain her lost American colonies, and after Austerlitz she attempted to corral the new States which Washington had erected and bring them through an alliance with her into a kind of relation as between suzerain and dependent State. That effort had failed on the verge of success by the bold action of one of the parties in the United States in declaring the war of 1812 against Great Britain.[1]

[1] It was John C. Calhoun's policy to consolidate American independence, by the war with Great Britain in 1812, and the French Minister accredited to Washington at the time with special instructions to direct his efforts toward preventing a fusion between the

The fear of entanglement in European matters, and the fear of European meddling in American affairs, which might endanger the independence of the United States, caused certain American Statesmen like Calhoun to look upon the decisions of the European Powers at the Verona Congress relative to the South American Republics, as precedents which might be applied against the United States. That mistrust was not entirely distasteful to British Statesmen as it furnished the elements of a situation where, by a friendly attitude England could appear as the especial friend of the United States as against a designing Europe.

The British Minister of the Crown, Canning, suggested to the American Minister, Rush, at London, and, through him to the Cabinet at Washington, that Great

United States and Great Britain was Comte Louis Sérurier, whose uncle was the famous Marechal de France of the same name, and whose father was an officer commanding French troops in the American war of Independence.

Britain should join the American action for the protection of the revolted Spanish Colonies against intended European repression.[1]

In a message to Congress, President Monroe, December 2, 1823, included the enunciation of the famous doctrine which afterwards bore his name.

The doctrine, which some consider a unilateral treaty, acknowledged tacitly only by the other nations, is not a treaty but — the principle of a policy.

At the moment of its enunciation by President Monroe the American fleet, especially in view of the proximity of its base to the scenes of eventual operations, was of some account. The British were supreme on the seas; the French and Spanish fleet, so soon after the Napoleonic wars, were not of the size nor strength to attempt any expedition, which could be opposed by the United States and regarded

[1] See letter of Jefferson to Madison October 2, 1823, and diary of John Quincy Adams, November 13, 1823.

with disfavor by the British Cabinet. The Russian fleet was held in Europe by the development of Turkish affairs arising out of the divergencies in the interpretation of the treaty of Bucharest of 1812, and its execution demanded by Russia from Turkey.

No European intervention in Spanish America was expedient and Spain recognised the independence of the former colonies.

It is ordinarily believed that the Monroe doctrine was responsible for the immunity of the South and Central American Republics from foreign aggression, but other causes contributed largely to that result. Adjustment of the European political conditions; the inadequacy of transport and communication across the Atlantic; the undeveloped foreign industrial demand for natural resources; the naval supremacy of England, and her position as the chief carrier and trader; and the seclusion of Japan.

It is a curious fact of coincidence that up to the eighties the Monroe doctrine, was only enforced when it was to England's interest to see it enforced, as in the case of forcing Russia back from the Pacific, the French expedition to Mexico, and the Spanish-American war when England imposed neutrality on Europe.

As applicable to herself, England considered the Monroe doctrine as non-existent, witness, the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which infers that hypothesis, recognising that England has rights of acquirement on the American continent.

The history of that treaty and the incidents of its negotiations, make evident that whatever Great Britain's claims were as to the right of extending her sovereignty over Central American territory — based on old pretensions never valid and never admitted by Spain,—" election reasons " involving interests of party-politics in America at the time of the negotiations, were the true

reasons for the acceptance of the English draft, which, in spirit, was a controversion of the Monroe doctrine.

Only in the eighties, President Hayes in a pronouncement concerning the French-Panama-Canal enterprise, began to define somewhat more clearly the scope of the doctrine; Cleveland's ultimatum to Great Britain on the Orinoco question set it on a firm basis and patched the rents made in it by the Clayton-Bulwer treaty; the Spanish-American war, some years later, was the triumph of that doctrine, and the acquisition of the Canal-territory and building of the Canal by the United States, its logic results.

The Hay-Pauncefote treaty, replacing the Clayton-Bulwer document, still, by ambiguity of formulation, admits of interpretation in the interest of Great Britain not only contrary to the spirit of the Monroe doctrine but which by extension would negate the sovereign rights of the United

States concerning her interior fiscal legislation,— as witness, the coast-wise shipping controversy.

The Monroe doctrine has only received tacit recognition by the Powers, and the attitude of the Central and South American States is that they are too weak to oppose it.

The five Bolivian Republics of Venezuela, Colombia, Peru, Equador and Bolivia, were forced to submit when the Washington State department put its veto to the formation of the so-called "Union Boliviana"— a defensive and offensive alliance which those States attempted to form and proclaim on the occasion of the celebration of their independence in 1911. Such an alliance would have borne heavily on the situations between the United States and Colombia concerning the Republic of Panama and its independence. Similarly, the policy of the United States was, and is, contrary to the effective union of the Central American Republics,— the Court

of Arbitration invented by Secretary Root was a kind of palliative against that movement and the interference of the United States in the interior affairs of these Republics has always favoured that President or Government who represented Separatism as against Federation. That policy of the United States is logical and is conditioned by the possession of the Panama Canal, and the exigencies of its local defences.

The South American States, especially Chile, Argentina and Brazil are unwilling to recognise the United States as holder of a mandate to defend the interests of Latin America; though they recognise well the good of its basic principle, they are loath to intrust the United States solely with the safe-guard of that principle. Those South American States possess increasingly strong military and naval organisations adequate for the defence of their own territories. Those States have more trade, banking and other relations with Europe than with

the United States, and do not relish any theory which would appear to assume economic and political hegemony by the United States over Latin American Republics, especially in view of the fact that they themselves are, militarily, qualified to enforce that doctrine in the American continent south of Panama.

The enormous economic development of Europe, demanding raw-products and markets for its industries, have made South America a field for European commercial exploitation and investment.[1]

These conditions of international commercial rivalry, emphasised by recent pretensions to economic preference for the United States in the Continents of the Americas and destined to be intensified by the monopolising tendencies of Japanese economical developments in the Far East,

[1] In this connection the project of the Morocco-Dakar Railroad, connected in the north with the Spanish and European railroad systems, and from Dakar in the south with the Brazilian Harbour of Pernambuco by fast Steamers, is interesting to note.

must ultimately test the Monroe doctrine to the utmost.

The enforcement of that doctrine exacts command of the Atlantic coasts of both North and South America, of the Caribbean Sea, the West coast of the Americas and the Pacific Ocean.

The centre of that radius is the Panama Canal, the most important and the weakest point of the United States coast lines.

The national defence of the United States imposes upon that country the characteristics inherent to an island power whose defence is a fleet, to be backed by a strong army, making that fleet not a defence of territory alone, but the fleet must be able to act purely as a fleet on the high seas, in the sense of the blue water school, and not as a harbour police force or floating coast fortresses.

CHAPTER V

EUROPEAN PROBLEMS OF INTERNATIONAL IMPORTANCE

A. THE ANGLO-GERMAN SITUATION.

"BEWARE! the sea threatens while it serves you, it bears you, but it environs you. The position of this island is such that there is no via media for her between being all powerful and being nothing at all. This is why she always was conquered until having subjugated the sea she in turn became mistress of the world. England will be the sea's victim the day she ceases to be its Queen." In these words the British Member of Parliament, Mr. Urquhart, characterised England's needs and conditions.

An Island State, it flanks the west coast

of Europe — it was subject of conquest from the continent until it recognised that its defence did not lie on the shores of the island but that the opposite continental shores are its walls. That the sea between these shores and its own home-coast must be its exclusive domain, and so long as the opposite shore is her border she is safe.

This situation made it a necessity for England to fight every nation on the European continent which developed its naval resources. Spain, Portugal, Holland and France were successively the enemies of England, and out of the wreckage of the colonial possessions of those States, England built up her empire encircling the globe.

The hundreds of years of warfare, which by the beginning of the nineteenth century made England the supreme power, were fought in Europe and less by England than by the European powers, which were England's allies. The more the nations of Europe fought among themselves, the

greater became the power of England. The battle-fields were Germany and Italy. The principal combatants were France — the Bourbons,— and the Hapsburgs.

Cromwell inaugurated the policy of intervening in the European struggles, either actively or by participation, or by granting subsidies, but always so as to be the power able to turn the scales. That policy was to limit the political and territorial expansion of any of the European States, and not to allow any one State to secure such a degree of power as to remain unaffected by any coalition including England.

After more than two hundred years of wars in Europe, France, England's foe, was finally beaten and out of the field. England emerged from the period of the Napoleonic wars with the mastery of the seas and the hegemony of Europe. Germany was disrupted, the same was true of Italy.

The political conditions in Europe were such that no one of the powers was strong

enough to menace England's domination, it was she who gave the law to Europe and shaped the destinies of its innumerable States.

The policies and trend of ideas in Europe were against all liberal thought; Metternich's system of absolutism was imposed as the proper form of Government; the wars of the French revolution, had destroyed the existing industries; the general police system of government was not favourable to any economic development, — England was the manufacturer, the importer and exporter,— the merchant of Europe with no competitor in industry, commerce or trade.

Although watching France, her old enemy, she then began to observe Russia in whose moves she saw danger to her possession of India. Throughout the whole of the nineteenth century England was hypnotised by Russia's progress in the East. Her eyes were constantly gazing at the Bosporus and Suez. The liberal

movements in Europe found platonic support in England — so long as they were in the direction of weakening the strength of the different States. The movement of "nationalities," whose open advocate was France under the Third Napoleon, was not regarded with favour in England, and her policy would have perhaps taken a more decided stand against that movement, if, in her constant preoccupation for India's safety and means to check Russia, she had not stood in need of a continental ally. That ally was France, who in turn, after having sought to approach Russia under the Restauration, desiring to find a partner able to aid her in regaining the prestige lost at the end of the Napoleonic wars,— had under the Third Napoleon with the same end in view, taken a strong anti-Russian stand.

The war of the Crimea gave to France the satisfaction of tearing up the treaty of Vienna and to England the illusion of hav-

ing curbed Russia and eliminated that power from the Black Sea. Russia was no more in the Mediterranean. The Crimea also allowed Sardinia, the ally of France and England to come forward and make ready for the task she had set herself of erecting a united Italy. Prussia, too, was slowly in her turn preparing for the work of blood and iron wrought by Bismark, a united Germany.

The Franco-Sardo-Austrian war, with its resultant defeat for Austria, made it possible for Sardinia — Piedmont — to head the national unifying movement and by 1861, some eighteen months later, United Italy was born,— to the displeasure of France. England, sympathetic to that new formation, when its success became imminent, saw in it a counter-balance to France.

This Italy, re-incarnate, a new power in the Mediterranean, changed the status quo in Europe making a breach in the

fundamental conditions of the continent, which had given England the casting vote among the nations.

When, on the 18th of January, 1701, the first Prussian King was crowned, the former Elector of Brandenburg, assuming that royal title, the General, Statesman and Councillor to the Hapsburg Emperor, Prince Eugene of Savoy, said that the worst blunder ever made by the Hapsburgs was to recognise the Elector of Brandenburg as King of Prussia. Soon afterward, under Frederick the Great, Prussia assumed a leading position not only in Germany but became of importance in the affairs of Europe. In opposition to the Hapsburg there was the Hohenzollern in Germany. The Napoleonic wars, the final defeat of Napoleon and Prussia's part in it augmented the prestige of that State.

In the so-called "Wars of liberation" (Befreiungs-kriege) against the French, constituting the new German movement,

Prussia took the lead. The ideal was a great Germany, led by Prussia, organised and strong, and in 1848 the liberal idealistic German Parliament, assembled at Frankfurt, offered to the King of Prussia the Imperial Crown of Germany, which he then refused. But the question had come forward for answer,—a great Germany under Hapsburg, or a Germany under Hohenzollern?

The Zoll-verein under the initiative of Prussia, drew into its membership by degrees nearly all the small German States with the exception of Austria. It was in 1854, that this question of the admittance of Austria into the German Zoll-verein was first posed by Austria. The Austrian defeat in Italy (1859), and the subsequent making of modern Italy, indicated to the Hohenzollern ruler that the time was near for Prussia to assert her leadership in Germany. With the accession of King William and his calling of Bismark to his council, Prussia, militarily and politically, was

rapidly made fit for the task which those two men, a great King, later, Emperor and his still greater councillor, had set before her.

Up to that time Germany had been for centuries the battle-field of Europe, her interior affairs or better said, the affairs between the various small German States, were the concern of everybody outside of Germany even more than of the German people. England, France, the Hapsburg, every one had his word to say, of " allowing " and " permitting "; it was the struggle for survival of the German nation. And as Cavour and Victor Emanuel had carried Piedmont to a victorious end in Italy's battle for life, so William and Bismark saw that it was Prussia's duty to the German nation to create the German Empire.

The quesion of the Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein was the touchstone of the future. The war against Denmark in 1864, the elimination of the other European

powers, France and England especially, from any decision in that matter by forming the condominium of Prussia and Austria in the Duchies, was the first step of Bismark's triumph in the sense of German self-assertion. The military preparedness of Prussia, supported by Austria, coupled with English military unpreparedness just after the Indian mutiny, and France, fully occupied with her Mexican adventure, cleared the way for Prussia to become the master of the situation. This was a second and graver shock to English policy, another and stouter blow at the mainstays of British dominance in Europe.

The subsequent Austro-Italian-Prussian war, which was the natural and expected consequence drawn by Bismark from the condominium of the Duchies ending in Austrian expulsion from Germany; the formation of the North-German Confederation under Prussia's lead and the military conventions between that new confederation and the south German States,

forced upon them by Bismark accomplished by successive steps the exclusion of outside interference in interior German affairs and laid the foundations of the Empire.

The defeat of Austria at Sadowa, as it was said in the French chamber — "was the defeat of France" — it was, too, the loss of the day to Great Britain, new conditions had arisen ominous for the future. For France, the rise of Germany was of grave import. The old fight between the western and the eastern parts of the Charlemagne empire was revived.

As a result of the Franco-German war the German Empire — finally formulated, rose out of the ruins of France.[1]

[1] It is well sometimes to recall the origins in that far past of this old question of the Rhine forming still to-day as it has in various guises during near onto a thousand years, a cause of bitter dispute and tension between nations, and the bases of its present status. It was created by the treaty of Verdun when the Empire of Charlemagne was separated into three parts — the western — France,— the eastern — Germany, and a center one called after its recipient Lothar, Lotharingen and comprising the Rhine-lands, (Holland,

The new Germanic power, possessing all the brute force and energy of a young nation and determined to be the undisputed master in her own house and the arbiter of her own future began to challenge the right of her neighbour, England, to control the German Seas.

Germany, new made, did not arouse in

Belgium, Alsace, Lorraine and including Italy). In the Middle-ages Alsace-Lorraine as well as Holland made part of the German State. During all the centuries of fight between Guelf and Ghibelline, the party opposing the central authority and the unity of the German State always found its ally in France. With the accession of the Hapsburgs to the Imperial throne and their extension of power over Spain, France entered the struggle against them and supported the Reformation movement in Germany. The oppression of the Germans by the Hapsburg Emperor Charles V.; his attempt to suppress protestantism and enforce catholicism in Germany by military means drove the German princes headed at that time by two Hohenzollerns, John and Adalbert, of Brandenburg, to ask protection of the French Crown. Henry II. accepted the title offered to him of "defender of German Freedom" and with the consent of the German princes French troops entered into possession of several of the fortified towns of Lorraine. In the thirty years war, which was begun by the attempt of Bohemia to over-

Great Britain the attention merited by so portentous an advent. The gaze of England fixed upon the affairs of India especially in regard to defence against Rus-

throw and expulse her Hapsburg ruler, France and Sweden were the supporters of the antagonists of Hapsburgs in Germany. By the treaty of Westphalen closing that war, France was in possession of Alsace: the power and ambition of the Hapsburg for mondial rule and the absorption of Germany was broken. French influence was established in German lands. A hundred years later Lorraine passed into French hands — by the marriage of Francis of Lorraine to Maria Theresa of Hapsburg and the cession of Lorraine to Stanislaus Lescinsky, father-in-law of Louis XV. upon whose death it fell to France.

This "France Rhenane" weighed heavily on the affairs in Germany. Germany was in three parts — the Austrian or Hapsburg part, the Prussian, the Hohenzollern part, and the rest, an agglomeration of small States, puppets in the hands of the neighbouring outside powers.

Alsace-Lorraine was the "knee under which France held Germany down." On one side France, on the other the Hapsburg whip, Germany was forced to look to Prussia. The expulsion of Austria and the formation of the North-German confederation were matters of life and death to new Germany, means of lifting that knee of France from its throat, which was accomplished by the Franco-German war, resulting in the German Empire.

sian advance in Asia prevented her statesmen from reading the future in the west accurately. It was otherwise in Europe: France was hypnotised by the "troue des Vosges"; Austria saw herself in danger between two new State formations both made at her expense, Italy in the south and Germany in the north. In 1871, Beust, the Austrian Chancellor said that an entente between Austria and Germany would be necessary for the preservation of Austria — he did not say "Austria" but "European Peace." Austria attempted then, as she attempts to-day, to reconstruct herself on a federal basis, aimed at englobing several of the Slavonic independent States which are the cultural centres of fragments of nationalities at present within her borders.

Germany herself, not yet strong, had to be guided safely through the many rocks and shoals of possible European combinations against her. Bismark, seeking to avoid any possible great European war

into which Germany could be drawn, entered first the "Entente of three Emperors," Germany, Russia, Austria and after the Congress of Berlin, in which Russia was humbled by England, Austria and France, and during which Bismark, as the "honest" broker, had earned Russia's enmity, Germany was forced into the Triple Alliance — Germany, Austria, Italy — a coldly political and artificial partnership without any natural basis, as all the elements, vital forces and foreign interests of each of these three powers are in antagonism.

The only one of these powers to obtain permanent and sound advantage from that alliance is Austria, and while it served Germany's purpose in its day, it is at present a drag on the development of that Empire.

Although England was slow to realize the magnitude of the menace to her supremacy raised up by the creation of a United Germany, and although she no

longer holds the balance of influence on the continent, the inherent weakness of the Triple Alliance, so long as it includes Austria, provides Great Britain with the opportunities — if advised in time — to set her house in order and still preserve what remains to her of her old supremacy. The inadequacy of the English land-forces, placing the burden of the defence of the British Isles on the fleet, cripples that part of the militant forces upon which the Empire reposes.

The changes wrought by Germany in Europe need not have been a danger to England had they not been followed by an enormous outburst of energy in all fields of human effort and her taking to the sea or as Bismark put it "cousin land-rat's taking it into his head to turn water-rat." Lockroy, former French Minister of Marine, in his "Lettres sur la Marine Allemande" says: —"Germany will be a great naval power in spite of her geographical position and history, her claims

to rule the waves will bring on war with Great Britain sooner or later,— that war will be one of the most terrible conflicts of the twentieth century."

Chatham said: "England's only fear here below is that France should become a naval, commercial and colonial power." What Chatham feared from France has, within the span of four decades, been realized by Germany. Still, in the seventies and eighties England with the monopoly of manufacturing industries, of engineering, of commerce, of banking and of shipping, seemed secure against any possible challenge, least of all would it have occurred to the English to be put in question by Germany, a group of States but just emerged from a state of troubled dream and formed into a conscious nation, which by geographical position, physical features, climate, agricultural soil, and mineral wealth was greatly inferior to England, and which, moreover, had in thirties of the nineteenth century asked English engi-

neers to come and show Germans how to set up manufacturing plants and how to work the weaving looms, which prior to the Unification had slowly grown up but languished without any strength or impulse.

The home-coming of the German nation flushed by victory on the battle-field brought an awakened consciousness of force into the peaceful activities of the life of the nation. As the Prussian school-master helped win the battles of Sadowa, Metz and Sedan, so the school-master brought all the questions of life into touch with scientific training. German schools made the German skilled in commerce and trade, and in all the branches of manufacture. In school the workman obtained the major part of his apprentice-ship and it was the University-trained chemist or engineer who became, and is to-day, the stone upon which the factories repose. These engineers and chemists are men of science, qualified to occupy a chair at any

University. The laboratories in the factories and manufacturing establishments always in the van of scientific research each in its branch are often finer and better equipped than many a laboratory in the Universities. It was this application of discipline and science thought by the army, which had given them the victory that now applied to industry and daily life, turned that giant over night into a conqueror in the fields of peaceful labour and commerce. Where, in England and elsewhere, the rule of the thumb still prevails, where actual manual apprentice-ship was preferred to school-learning, the German, even the ordinary labourer, is often a skilled workman by reason of his school-training.

This thoroughness of trained capacities, has made Germany the most formidable and most dangerous rival of Great Britain on sea and on land. The Teuton is already encroaching more and more on what is considered, or has been considered as England's exclusive political and economic pre-

serves. The situation between the two rivals resolves itself more and more into the question: — Will Germany succeed in driving England to the wall, by force of study and patient application to industry and gradual mastery of the world's commerce or will she consummate that result by force of arms?

In any study of the Anglo-German relations, account must be taken of the differing conceptions of the two nationalities concerning the position of the State and its duties towards the citizens.

The Germans hold that their conception of the function of the State has been one of the chief causes if not the principal source of its success. The British watchword is individualism, free-exchange, non-interference, or as Bagshot said: —"the natural impulse of the English is to resist authority . . . we look on State-action not as our own action but as an alien action, as an imposed tyranny from without, not as the

consummated result of our organised wishes." In Germany, Nation and State, and State and society are practically one, acting in political and economical matters as a unit. Where, in England the Government has no initiative and no influence on the industries, transport-facilities, etc., in Germany, it was the State who took the initiative, fighting against inertia and conservatism of the people, and all the measures of legislation which gave Germany her skilled labour, workman insurance, workman school acts, etc., transportation by land and water, were the initiative acts of the government.

The economic war has raged hotly for more than a decade. Both nations are convinced that the trade-interests of the one cannot live side by side with those of the other. Their commerce cannot remain in competition, neither can they combine, one must be supreme and the other subordinated. German commerce is gain-

ing everywhere, her industries expand, and her manufactured articles gradually invade the markets of the world; British commerce and industries are being slowly pushed out of the field. In Germany, unemployment is an exception; in England, it has become the chronic condition, all along the line increasing success has been on the side of Germany during this war-in-peace. Actual military warfare would not in principle be a break in conditions it would be only the continuation of an already existing state of hostilities.

England, leaving her "splendid isolation" has veered around to her former adversaries, France and Russia, and for the time being, the Triple-entente, counterbalancing the Triple-alliance has been the keeper of the peace in Europe.

But both combinations possess many elements of artificiality which cause them on several points to increasingly fail of their purpose. For instance, Germany at

the present moment finds the value of Austria so deteriorated that she is forced to increase the already heavy burden of her armaments; and in the camp of the Triple-entente dissatisfaction is expressed in France because of England's inadequacy of army. Again, England's approach to Russia is on a basis of some common political interests and mutual concessions, but in fact, England reducing to a minimum what she holds to be the necessary requirements for her defence of India, could never afford to concede what Russia would ask for as the minimum of her necessities.

England's most advantageous policy has returned to the principle that guided it during the eighteenth century, resulting in such imperial trophy, that is to fight the cocks of Europe against one another wherever the cock-pit chances to be. And as the Hapsburgs fought England's battles in the past centuries, so again, Austria is the most useful country of Europe to England's scheme.

So, too, the Balkan Allies went to England to be despoiled of part of the lands and liberties for their co-nationals which they had earned on the battle-fields in fair and hard-won fight.

The value of the Hapsburg to England arises not only from the peculiar situation of Austria in regard to Germany but because Austria herself exists solely by creating, fostering and exploiting rivalries and strifes between nations, and can always turn to her own advantage any war not waged against the Hapsburg dominions.

Slav and German are destined to live side by side and on the basis of that geographical fact, in some intelligent age — when Germany shall have seen the fallacy of supporting feudal conceptions, and completed German nation-making in Europe, a stable working-agreement insuring peace will be arrived at by those two inevitable neighbours between whom war would be extremely costly without any kind of compensation.

Germany has formulated her imperial needs as — an extended coast-line, mouth of the Shelde and Rhine, with the Dutch possessions in the Far Seas, and colonies. France possesses such colonies, but those of England are more desirable still, and she it is who stands watch over the Netherlands.

Germany, a continental power, connected by land frontiers with other countries, would receive a set back from a defeat by Great Britain, and her commerce and industries would suffer but the harm would not be irreparable. A German victory would threaten the very existence of the British Empire, which would lose to the Teuton, colonies and naval stations, while the English industries and commerce would receive a death-stroke.

The out-come of that eventual conflict cannot fail to be portentous for the whole earth.

B. THE HAPSBURG PROBLEM.

Austria-Hungary is a conglomeration of conquests of territories and bits of territory inhabited by fragments of nations whose racial and national centres with but two exceptions, lie outside of Austro-Hungarian borders in neighbouring States on East, West, North and South.

This conglomeration of peoples and lands without common interests is ruled by and for the sole benefit of one family, the Hapsburg dynasty, whose motto is: — "plus ultra" and "Austria Est Imperare Orbi Universo" (Austria has the right to rule the whole Universe) and whose policy always was: "divide et impera."

The Hapsburg rulers ruined Spain and sucked it dry of blood and treasure, not for the building up or aggrandizement of that country, but in order to seize Germany and impose Hapsburg despotism upon the whole world: — it was in the un-

ceasing effort to realize their device that a Hapsburg despatched the Armada to the subjugation of the British Isles — to be perhaps remembered by England when Hapsburg again sends another Armada to Suez. The Swiss in time of William Tell had rebelled from the Hapsburg principle of the enslavement and exploitation of peoples for the still greater augmentation of Hapsburg riches and domination; it was only when the Netherlands had freed themselves from the Hapsburg tyranny that they were able to rise to greatness as a nation; the thirty years war began when Bohemia attempted in 1618, to expel the foreign Hapsburg: — that struggle which wrecked the Tcheque State and completely exhausted the life-forces of that land — then one of the richest and most civilised of all Europe — goes on still to-day, unquenched by the bloodshed of centuries. Since the battle of Mohacs Hungary has wrestled, without pause in combat, with Austria, striving for national liberty, and

Map Showing Distribution of the Different Races in Austria-Hungary and the Balkans

even throwing herself at one moment into the arms of the Turk in effort to wrench herself free of the Hapsburg grip. Intolerable Hapsburg exactions drove the Germans to hail a French King "as defender of German liberties"; Italy, though she was able to tear herself free from the Hawks will still need many a day before she can replenish the land they preyed upon; it was only when the German principalities, duchies and kingdoms under Prussia's lead expulsed the Hapsburgs that they were able to come together in the organised and corporate life of a modern State and build German greatness from within.

Not only in these gigantic struggles for freedom of the different nations, but in almost every other war in Europe the cause direct or indirect lay in the Hapsburg determination, against the laws of nature and the will of races, to conquer all countries and bind them to tribute of blood and gold.

By her Dual organisation constitutionally, two minorities the Germans in Austria and the Magyars in Hungary are enabled to rule and dominate all the other races. This abnormal political situation is aggravated by an equally unsound state of affairs in matters economic, causing a general sense of insecurity in which the economic grievances of the people become identified with their various mutual national mistrusts and hatreds.

The Hapsburg lands are rich in soil and in mineral deposits and favourably situated in every way for the development of prosperity.

Up to half a century ago Austria-Hungary had been chiefly agricultural, though already ridden with great feudal estates. With brusque suddenness at that time, a wave of industrialism excited by the great fortunes yielded from industries in England and France, swept over Austria-Hungary; whole countries were artificially thrown into industrial development not in

response to an overflow of population but by the great landed proprietors who had already begun to work their estates commercially. In England and elsewhere surplus population had made manufacture and industries a logical growth if not a necessity, but in Austria-Hungary there was no surplus population and industrial cheap labor was created by pauperising the small farmer classes. The Austrian wage-scales of labour are those of the sweat-shop, with its corollaries of ignorance, vice and crime, witness the statistics of births showing the percentage of illegitimacy of the whole to be: 23.5 per cent. in Lower Austria ranging to 39.4 per cent. in the Austrian Crownland of Carinthia.

The vast landed estates increase in numbers and augment in extent, absorbing the lands which formerly gave homes to hundreds of thousands of small farm owners. To-day, Austria-Hungary furnishes the spectacle to the world of a yearly emigration of over half-a-million [one million in

1912 according to recently published Vienna statistics] of unhappy human beings abandoning the lands of their birth in quest of a more tolerable existence in far countries.

Austria-Hungary, freighted with feudalistic traditions and ideas, is to-day, par excellence,— and solely among modern States — the survival of the mediæval conception of a State as being a dynasty and its possessions, in opposition to the natural and present day acceptation of a State as being the expression of a national will and entity.

The methods of aggrandisement or empire-building of that mediæval concept, as contradistinct from the modern plan of colonising and civilising empty or quasi-empty lands, inhabited by savage or undeveloped races,— was, to over-run adjoining civilized countries of different races with huge devastating armies aimed at the national destruction of those countries and

the forcible annexation of their territories by the conqueror, whose task thenceforth, was the obliteration of language and creed with up-rooting of native traditions, institutions and personality, and the levying of taxes and soldiers for further conquests.

Because of this anachronism and all it involves, Austria-Hungary is in itself, a problem fraught with danger to the peace of Europe.

The Hapsburg possessions, spoils of conquests at one time or another, include four and a half million Poles in the north, over four million Russians in the north-east, three and a half million Rumanians in the east, six and a quarter million Serbo-Croats and Slovenes in the eastern part of the south, about eight hundred thousand Italians in the western districts in the south and about ten million Germans in the west.

Each of these national groups is a fragment of an adjoining mother-nation,

whose blood is in its veins, whose language it speaks and which is its cultural centre. All of these fragments belong to different nations. All of these fragmentary groups have been lopped-off from the parent nation by the sword and not by any geographical barrier.

Amid all the Hapsburg possessions, two nations alone form complete entities, having no co-nationals outside of Austria-Hungary. These are the Magyars, numbering nine million in a compact mass occupying a natural basin, and eight million Tcheko-Slovacks inhabiting a continuous strip of mountains and plain.

This heterogeneous composite of strange yoke-fellows are kept in hand by a complex and ruthless system of pitting them one against another, playing off against one another national susceptibilities, rousing and fanning religious rivalries and animosities, using soldiers of one nation to oppress and suppress the members of a differing race or creed, and by this foster-

ing of legendary hatreds during centuries among the various peoples maintaining a working equilibrium in the dominion.

A system of police served by a network of spies closely enmeshing the intimate and domestic life of all citizens,— corrupt and unimaginable to the world — outside of Turkey under Abdul Hamid — further complicated by a tyrannous hierarchy of patronage bending every department of public service or private accomplishment to a degrading subserviency.

These conditions are the logical effects of nations held in subjection, for only through corruption and vice and the surrender of individual will and pride of integrity can nations be held down by a foreign conqueror.

During the last one hundred years, one by one of the fragments of nations within the Austro-Hungarian boundaries have awakened to self-consciousness and a sense

of their relationship to their parent-nations across the borders, recognising and asserting with increasing definitiveness their racial characteristics, they have begun to recall to mind and observe the ideals and cultural trend of their mother-nations and to fall in somewhat with the rhythmic beat of home movements. In this age of human rights they realise that they did not choose, but were chosen; that they have no say as to their own destinies, no free expression of their own will. With but cramped opportunity for the development of their own racial impulses they experience a sense akin to captivity, and cease to see any hope in the state of separation of their lands from the home countries. The mother-lands too, are not less conscious of them — standing at the door. It seems inevitable that sooner or later the door should open.

The hopes of the Italia irredenta, the movement for the re-erection of Poland,

and the agitation among Austrian Russians for re-union with Russia, are well known.

Less known to the western world and less understood, is the situation of the three and a half million Rumanians tucked close within the curved Rumanian kingdom, like a child in the lap of its mother. An occurrence in 1892, serves to illustrate the strong desire for national unification of those Rumanians of Transylvania in Austria-Hungary. In the midst of agitation they formulated their demand "either for self-government" within the Hapsburg borders or else for outright annexation to their mother-kingdom Rumania. The signers of that memorandum were arrested and imprisoned. Vienna, employing strong measures, was able to crush down the movement, chiefly owing to the action within the Rumanian Kingdom itself of the King of Rumania, a foreigner in the land, who, indifferent to national aspirations as is apt to be the way with a ruler of foreign race, suppressed the Rumanian league which

had been formed to work for the liberation of their brothers from the Hapsburg yoke.

It can scarcely be doubted that a national ruler in Rumania would not have made the recent mistake, agreeable to Austria, of demanding of Bulgaria a small and unimportant triangle of territory, thus arbitrarily turning her back on the interests of the several million Rumanians outside of her borders.

Instead of being led for a petty cause into creating an irritation between that country and her Bulgarian neighbour, a national ruler would have been swift to perceive the value of the new Balkan powers whose interests on every point are identical with her own.

Of the Balkan Allied States, Bulgaria alone, with her new acquisitions, has rounded out her borders to include the whole of the territory inhabited by her co-nationals, and has completed the making of the Bulgarian nation. Her gaze must

henceforth be directed eastward towards Asia Minor.

Greece has yet to make her limits include all the Isles and the Greek lands in Asia.

Servia has still to complete her nation-making, as even with the recent accruement resulting from the liberation of Serb territories from the Turk, there yet remains some forty thousand square miles of Serb territory and over six million Serbs outside her borders in those provinces of the Serb Block which have, from time to time, been annexed by Austria-Hungary, either by violent seizure, or as a gift from Europe in diplomatic deals, where the fate of peoples was subordinated in the councils of the great powers, to the convenience of providing a price "to boot" in the game of give and take.

The independent Kingdom of Servia as it was up to the 17th of last October, with a population of barely three million,

and which was with Montenegro the only free part of Servian territory, *is* within those limits *the only country in the world with no pauper classes and consequently no poor-houses*.[1]

Examination of the causes of these conditions does not come within the scope of the present volume, but considered broadly, they are of two-fold origin: the social organisations which have been evolved during the centuries from the Serb root-idea of brotherhood as the basis of human relationship; the other cause of non-pauper-

[1] This statement will be found recorded in the Statesman's Yearbook under Servia.

It would be superfluous to state exception at this present time when every man, woman and child throughout both Servian Kingdoms are making heroic sacrifices of goods and life itself to help in the war of liberation, where many women are serving not only in the commissariat and hospitals but are actually fighting with the guns side by side with their brothers and husbands, when nearly every home has lost a father or brothers or husband, when there are bound to be many orphans, that there is intense suffering and need, conditions which must prevail for some time after the war.

AUSTRIA
HUNGARY
TRANSYLVANIA
CROATIA
SLAVONIA
BATCHKA
BANAT
RUMANIA
BOSNIA
SERVIA
DALMATIA
HERZEGOVINA
MONTENEGRO
ALBANIA
BULGARIA
MACEDONIA
GREECE
ADRIATIC SEA
SERVIAN SEA
ITALY
VENICE
TRIESTE
ANCONA
ROME
NAPLES
BARI
BRINDISI
TARANTO
Str. of Otranto
SALONICA
Gulf of Salonica
Map showing
The Serb-inhabited Block
of Territory.
Railroad
Canal
Border of States
of Provinces
Towns

ism no doubt, has close connection with the fact that the vast waves of gigantic industrial exploitation which have swept over western lands, binding literally, whole populations to the wheel, creating at once fabulous riches for the few and miseries and thralldoms for the many hitherto unknown in the world's history, have not yet invaded Servia to overwhelm and to blot from existence those freehold homes spread evenly among its population which have caused it to be called by Europeans "The poor man's paradise."

COPY.
ANDREW CARNEGIE,
2 East 91st St.

NEW YORK, 29th Nov., 1912.

Prince Lazarovich-Hrebelianovich,
Care Duffield & Co., Publishers,
36 West 37th Street, New York.

DEAR PRINCE LAZAROVICH-HREBELIANOVICH: Many thanks for your treasured volumes, which will give me what I do not possess — a thoro knowledge of the Servian people. What you told me about them interested me deeply. I

feel myself drawn to dip into these volumes on my first day of leisure. One needs to know a country where there are no pauper classes, no workhouses or necessity for poor-relief.

This gives other nations something to live up to.

With renewed expression of appreciation, I am

Very truly yours,

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

In Belgrade, foreign influences have somewhat crept in, which either unwittingly or consciously, tend to discourage many characteristic Serb customs and ideals. These effects, are possibly, partly owing to the vicious position of a Capital too close to the enemy's borders, but they have not been able to penetrate to any extent the country at large, which still remains true to itself. As in Serb Lands seized by Austria-Hungary, every effort has been exerted to destroy those Serb institutions, so too, within the Kingdom itself, forces representing foreign interests either political or economical, steadily es-

say to undermine those organisations, so fundamental to the national strength. Emissaries or agents in various benign guises even pass through the country districts attempting to sow dissatisfaction, preaching a veritable crusade against the existing order.

On the other hand, social statisticians and educators of the first rank are at present leaving American shores to study the Servian social conditions, in the interests of movements for thorough social reconstruction which the western world under the sense of growing disillusion with the results of heartless industrial exploitation and unequal conditions generally, is beginning to recognise as necessary for the stability of civilisation.

It might not, perhaps, be too wild a hope that the principles embodied in the Serb institutions, which are neither socialism nor communism, but an entirely workable form of co-operation tested by centuries, may come in time to form the basis of that

industrial regeneration which is the object of so much earnest research in western lands.

The conditions in the free Kingdom of Servia, where every man may have his own home with free education of a high standard, where there are no pauper-classes, where the whole population has a voice in a truly constitutional government, furnish a striking contrast with the state of affairs in the Serb Lands held in thrall by Austria-Hungary: — Croatia-Slavonia, Banat, Batchka, Dalmatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, where the Serb institutions have been, and are being, systematically broken down and destroyed thus setting at large countless numbers of paupers forced into industrial slavery or emigration.

To illustrate by Croatia — which has been the longest in Austro-Hungarian hands: — Of the total revenue of Croatia, fifty-six per cent. is paid into the Hungarian treasury, the remaining forty-four per cent. being the only amount available

to meet the expenses of the local Croat administration. In 1901 the total revenue was 44,683,723 crowns[1] which, after deducting the expenses of collection and official manipulation, left a net revenue of 36,120,150 crowns, so that the fifty-six per cent. to Hungary was 20,227,284 crowns and the remaining forty-four per cent. for Croatia was 15,892,864 crowns. The Croatian apportionment having to cover all administrative and public affairs, educational, etc., in the country, cannot even come near to being sufficient. The Croatian exchequer is in a chronic state of deficit. In 1904 the internal Croatian budget called for an expenditure of 20,600,000 crowns, creating for that year a deficit of 3,800,000 crowns. The free Kingdom of Servia with the same race and an area and population of about the same extent had in 1907 an income of 95,000,000 francs with well balanced expendi-

[1] One crown equals about 21 cents, and one franc equals 20 cents.

ture, leaving a revenue surplus of 41,000 francs. Servia, with no emigration and no paupers, Croatia, with an enormous emigration of illiterate and unskilled labour and a population practically starving.

It can easily be understood that suspension of constitutional guarantees — a discipline frequently "necessitated," rule by police measures, military force or any other form or degree of stern repression by the Austro-Hungarian Government, is powerless to stifle the Serb desire for national liberty, or definitively withstand or withhold the tide which carry these provinces toward union within the borders of a great and free Servian State.

It might appear natural to suppose that the Germans form the one satisfied group of the Hapsburg dominions, but such is not the case. The increasing strength and pride of the German Empire arouses a Pan-Germanic impulse among Austrian Germans who would wish to share the

power and well-being of that mighty creation which represents their own racial genius, and in union with which, alone, they can find full scope of individual and national expression. The irresistible tug of this deep under-tow finds startling indication not only in the "Wacht am Rhein" and "Heil Dir im Siegeskranze" sang with clink of mugs, but in the cries of "down with Hapsburg" and "long live Hohenzollern" which have burst forth on more than one occasion under the windows of the Imperial palace at Vienna.

When Bismark had built the German Empire and saw that it was good, he saw too, that considerations involved in safeguarding its course until it should have grown used to its more infinite orbit, necessitated conclusions of arrangements which would delay to a later period of time the full rounding out of new Germany's nation-making.

These arrangements aimed at providing

time for interior consolidation and at preventing the formation of hostile coalitions. The designation of Austria as a European necessity was at the time literally true in the German sense. Germany became more and more drawn into the periphery of Austrian interests, although with the rise of other nations and the interior loosening of bonds in the Hapsburg realm, that necessity and its intrinsic effectiveness have been ever on the decrease.

Emperor William, willy nilly, under the mesmeric spell of Bismark's genius, or for some other causes, failing to note that the famous necessity began some time ago to be outworn, has still stubbornly held his Empire bound to an arrangement, which has led him into actions of no value to Germany, even necessitating at the present time heavy increase of German armaments and financial burdens, and the uselessness of which is beginning to be generally recognised among the German people, who do not relish the prospect of

having to shoulder the gun for the Hapsburg.

The collapse of Austria-Hungary is inevitable.

Will Germany read aright the writing on the wall? — understanding that as the situation is henceforth, Austria is a millstone around her neck, and holds immobilized vast resources of German material necessary to the completion of her nation-making without which the work of German Empire construction must halt.

For long, Europe has been accustomed to think of Poland as the past tense of, "Abandon hope all ye who enter here," counting as final, the disposition of the Polish question, and in the belief of statesmen, a Poland retaining certain of its ancient disabling theories, could not survive in the Europe of to-day. But among the Poles themselves, a new spirit of nationality, based on a new and corrected conception of independence, has assumed be-

ing, inspiring the populations with visions of a reconstructed State avoiding old causes of weakness, a country in which they, too, shall build in the new time.

"Poland is not yet lost"—but liveth.

The most potent factors in this Polish resurrection are:—a new apprehension of the meaning of national liberty, and the awakening realization that the fact of most importance to them is that they are Slavs.

At the time of reconstruction in Russia the idea was mooted and supported by the Prime-minister Stolypin, to endow Russian Poland with independent Home-Rule within the Russian Empire. Austria and Germany made protests, which at that critical period of crisis in Russia, could not be ignored. It is incontestable that by such a measure Russia would attain the summit of sagacious statesmanship; it is not less to be doubted that she would by that act have thrown both Austrian and Prussian Poland into flames, in an attempt

to make junction with such a newly created Poland.

Following the utter failure in the Hapsburg Realm of the Metternich system of oppression and feudal assertion, and the collapse of the Bach system, constitutional reconstruction expressing different points of view were proclaimed, but without effectual realization. In 1867, came the dual constitutional reorganisation separating the Hapsburg provinces into Austrian and Hungarian. This arrangement was made to support the great Austrian scheme of crushing Prussia with French help and re-establishing Hapsburg imperialism in Germany.

As that reconstruction was accomplished solely for the foreign imperialistic purposes of the Dynasty, regardless of the interior needs of the realm, the structure was unsound and its inherent weakness and instability soon became apparent, aggravating the centrifugal tendencies of the

heterogeneous elements of the realm, portending disruption.

As a measure of consolidating the Hapsburg throne, a federation was proposed with self-government for the various national fragmentary groups, but that theory was found impracticable on account of the strong national feeling among those groups and the contiguity of their lands with the territories of their several parent-nations outside of the Hapsburg borders; the sole remaining conclusion — conceding the hypothesis of the necessity of a Hapsburg Empire — has led to the present Hapsburg decision, that their only way of retaining imperial power lies in the out and out military conquest of the three neighbouring nations, fragments of whose territories and peoples they have already brought under their sway: — Those nations are: Servia, Rumania and Poland.

Austria's present bold attempts to despoil Montenegro and Servia of the lands they have liberated from the Turk and to

create for them a situation of perpetual insecurity and menace, using Albania for that purpose, is one of the steps laid down by Vienna in the plan to conquer Servia.

The mediæval means which the Hapsburgs propose of solving their dynastic problem, could only be accomplished with the help of Germany and Italy, and would be accompanied by the dreaded armageddon, turning all Europe into one vast battle-field.

It has been suggested that the solution of the Hapsburg problem least dangerous to Europe and more in accordance with modern State formations would be the dissolution of the incongruous Austro-Hungarian Empire and the joining of each of the national fragments to its mother-nation, leaving the entities of Tcheck and Magyars as a remainder.

The Germans would join the German Empire. The Poles would join Poland,

the Rumanians Rumania, the Servians Servia, the Russians Russia, etc.

But the plan of the Hapsburgs is to conquer with the sword the adjoining motherlands and sovereign States, Rumania, Servia, Montenegro, Greece and Bulgaria and so to impose over a vast expanse of territory the mediæval system of a Dynasty and its possessions.

In this age of the rights of man and the rights of nations, the survival of the Hapsburg lust for personal dynastic agrandisement and power, especially, taking into consideration the miserable system of human exploitation in all lands coming under Hapsburg sway — is a menace to Europe and to all that the centuries have won for freedom throughout the world.

APPENDIX A

An open letter in the Servian language of which the following is an English translation, was published, in the second week of March, 1912, in Belgrade in the leading Servian Newspapers including the *Tribuna*. It was also published during the same period in Montenegro and other Serb lands.

To-day when strange rumours of Servian downfall are printed in the daily press throughout the world, and when Servia must again either prove her right to exist as an independent State and her strength both moral and material to enforce that right, or else be overwhelmed, I trust that as a simple Servian I may without apology submit for your consideration thoughts which must be uppermost in the minds of all Serbs wherever Serbs are. The fact that these rumours are without doubt inspired by those who would

wish them to be true makes them none the less worthy of attention.

In 1908, prior to the seizure of Bosnia, the late King Edward VII., of England, sent the following message through a high official, who still holds his post at the British Court: "Tell Lazarovich that Europe is not going to permit the Servians to make their Unification," to which the answer was: "It is God who permits — It was not by the will of Europe that Italian unity was made, nor by Europe's permission that the Germans created their unification in 1866 and 1871."

We forget too easily the international importance of Servia and the reasons of that importance.

We must remember that, the present fierce competition among European powers for trade and political supremacy in the Orient has intensified the Near Eastern Problem in all its complexity. This problem involves the possession and control of that part of the world which, by its command of the land routes and the waterway via Suez eastward, including those points where the most direct communications between East and West can be interrupted, forms the strategic key to the Orient and Southern Asia.

Appendix

The main strategic point of the Near East commanding the whole Balkan Peninsula lies in Servia.

There also at Nish cross the two great longitudinal valleys forming the shortest and most direct roadway between Europe and the Orient. From Nish these two roads lead one eastward to Constantinople and Asia, the other southward to Salonika and Suez.

That supreme strategic position places the Servian States and the Servian people in the front rank of significance in regard to the Near Eastern Problem. In fact the very kernel of the Near Eastern Question is an international contest for the possession of the Servian plateau as well as of Suez and Constantinople.

God has given to us Serbs this dominant strategic position in the Balkan Peninsula and made us the keeper of this great gateway between Europe and the Orient. Peril is bound up with this trust, which focuses upon Servia the desire of other nations, but this sacred trusteeship holds also the potentiality of national greatness.

To guard the way from the Danube to the Ægean Sea is the Servian mission.

The line of natural gravity for Servian development is towards the south by the Vardar valley through the old Servian lands to the Ægean

Sea with Salonika as Servian Port. Along this direction lies the only possible trend of constructive policy insuring an enduring and powerful Servian State.

We have to remember that this policy formed the basis of the work of Nemanya culminating in the Servian Empire under Dushan.

The revolt of Vukashin alone made possible a battle of Kossovo.

The defeat of Kossovo and the death of Lazar wrecked and dashed to earth all that the Nemanyas and the Servian people had built up during the centuries and annihilated Servian unity and all constructive Servian policy from that day to this.

The present site of the Servian Capital on the northernmost border and looking north is a symbol of all that has been wrong and mistaken in Servian policy since the days of Kossovo.

In that direction lies Servian annihilation.

Either Servia must turn and go frankly and squarely along her true old road southward building up anew the fallen walls of her past greatness or she must inevitably become absorbed by her stronger neighbours and sink into oblivion.

In this connection I venture to recall a project

which I framed many years ago for the construction of a waterway from the Danube to the Ægean Sea, and whose realisation will some day contribute an economic measure of first importance not only to the accomplishment of Servian destiny aiding the development of her productive resources, but it is self-evident that this waterway which will complete the extensive canal and river-systems of Central Europe, shortening the way from the North Seas to Suez by 3000 Kilometres, will be of vast international benefit, making it therefore a sound and practical proposition.

In the interest of this project I laid before the Royal Servian Government in 1909, plans and estimates which I had caused to be prepared by the most eminent Servian Engineer for the regularisation and canalisation of the Morava and Vardar Rivers and a Canal connecting them across Preshevo watershed, so to form a continuous waterway from the mouth of the Morava and the Danube in Servia to Salonika, which would thereby become the most important commercial port in Eastern Mediterranean.

In such times as these, Serbs need to remember the three precious gifts of inheritance which our fathers have left us: —

Our Holy Orthodox Faith, so sublime and so

simple that an English political writer has written of it:—"In view of the present conditions caused by commercialism in Western countries which make the few rich richer, and the many poor poorer still, the despairing poor of all Anglo-Saxondom might see in the Holy Orthodox Church an aspect of Christianity new to them and one they might accept" and "that a wave of religious revival such as the world has several times seen might roll over the West and, at the right psychological moment, unite all within the Holy Orthodox Creed."

Our second legacy from our fathers is the glory of their achievements in wars of self-defence.

The third gift they have bequeathed to us is their wisdom embodied in the Servian social institutions formulating the principles of human brotherhood and individual rights, and high ideals of pure and noble manhood and womanhood. Thanks to those fundamental institutions Servia, alone, of all western countries is spared the sad sight of thousands of men, women and children working under the condition of slaves in the mines and factories with half-empty stomachs or else dying of hunger in the streets, such as is seen not only in neighbouring lands but in France, in England and in America.

The inheritance by the Serbs of these great institutional blessings which have been developed among our people through the ages and are always seeking more and more perfect formulation, gives to Servians a right to be proud and justifies our undying faith in the future of our country and our race.

Much has been urged on the subject of allies, but our people have to consider that they can never successfully ask until they have something substantial to offer in return. We all know that no nation can be strong unless it is united in spirit and determination to win — and that nation which works together as one man, combining its energies for the accomplishment of a sound constructive policy, is bound to win, and will have no need to seek allies, because other nations will soon perceive its value and seek its alliance.

Servia's best ally has always been Servia.

The conquering might of a nation as of an army is not in mere numbers — not in big battalions, nor yet in the sole mechanical superiority of the armament, but that which makes an army or a nation irresistible is the spirit of the man behind the gun and the spirit of the nation back of that man. As it was said of Napoleon that

his presence in battle was worth an Army corps, so let us remember that the power of the true Serb spirit was proved when Milenko Stoykovich and his 2000 men defeated Hafiz Pasha and his 40,000 at the battle of Ivankovatz, making every Serb literally worth 20 Turks.

The sure stronghold of Servian defence is the soul of every Servian man and woman who understands the value among nations of the Serb race, and who thrills to the necessity of a united determination to build up from within a national strength grounded on the foundations laid by our fathers, embodying the Christian principle of brotherly love which has been the germ ideal of our institutions for centuries: — a glorious State representing the creation of purely Servian Genius.

I would that every one in the land could be able to compare the Serb social institutions, ideals and achievements with those of other nations. I think then all might, irrespective of political party, join hands with all those patriotic brothers whose hearts are in this consecrated work of giving to Servia the proud place in the world which is hers by right.

LAZAROVICH-HREBELIANOVICH.

February 26, 1912.

APPENDIX B

MEMORANDA

The following pages cited from the text of two Memoranda submitted, indicate progressive steps by which the Macedonian Committee sought to obtain effective relief: —

I.

Macedonian Committee to His British Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

Re: No. 27630.

NOVEMBER, 1903.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: I have the honour to submit the following suggestions to your Excellency. . . .

The origin of the strife and miseries of the Christian populations in European Turkey (Macedonia) can be found in: —

1st. The Agrarian and Taxation Question.

2nd. The issues and complications involved in

the Question of Supreme Ecclesiastical Authority. Autonomous Church Government is identified with Nationality in the minds of the Orthodox Christian population throughout the Balkan States.

1st. The solution of the Agrarian and Taxation question could be based upon a plan reverting to the original system in existence before 1829, by which the Headmen of the villages or Elders of families collected all taxes and remitted them to the proper authority.

The rate of taxation in those times was generally estimated and fixed by common accord for a number of years in advance. The same system, which was also applied, in the relations of landlord and tenant, could be reverted to, and made general. That would prevent the authorities and landlords from coming into direct contact with the people, and thereby remove the oppression and abuses at present connected with tax-collection. A reversion to that old system would be, as it proved before, entirely to the interests of the Imperial Ottoman treasury.

2nd. In regard to the question of Autonomous Church Administration.

There is in creed, dogma and canonical law

no difference between the Patriarchat or Greek Church and the Exarchat or Bulgarian Church. The separation refers only to autonomy of administration.

The excommunication of the Bulgarian Exarch was pronounced on account of administrative disobedience, and the strife, comparable to a fight between two Bishops of the same Church for a parish in the same diocese.

At the time of the erection of the Exarchat only a part of the Slavonic populations of those districts to-day forming the disturbed localities in Macedonia, came forward to recognize the Bulgarian Exarch as their religious head and claimed to be part of the new "milet" or "nation" of the Exarch.

The strife in those districts is the fight between Greek Patriarch and Bulgarian Exarch for the extension of their respective dioceses; national conscience enters into that contest only in so far as Patriarch and Exarch represent rival national propaganda.

It is believed that the following measures would put an end to these strifes, and make pacification of the country possible.

Bulgaria (Bulgaria proper and Eastern Rumelia) to be declared independent and erected into a Kingdom.

That measure would automatically cause the Archbishopric of Bulgaria (to-day suffragan of the Exarch and identified with the limits of the State of Bulgaria) to become an autonomous administrative autocephalous Church.

When, in 1870, the Exarchat was erected it was in fact the re-erection of the old Bulgarian Patriarchat of Tirnovo (in Bulgaria proper) that had been suppressed by the Phanar about 180 years ago; but for political reasons the title "Exarch" was adopted and Constantinople taken as See, instead of title "Patriarch of Tirnovo" with See at Tirnovo in Bulgaria proper.

Entirely independent from the Bulgarian autonomous Church thus limited to the Bulgarian Kingdom, there would remain in Constantinople an autonomous Bulgarian Metropolitan with jurisdiction limited within the Turkish borders.

This creation of an independent and autonomous Church administration within Turkey would remove the "legal pretext of Bulgarian national propaganda," which is the cause to-day of so much bitter strife and violence in Macedonia.

This accomplished, the second measure would be: —

To divide European Turkey, (Albania ex-

cluded, into four Autonomous, Autocephalous Metropolitan Dioceses.

A. The land north of the border of the Kingdom of Greece and south of a line straight from east to west, beginning at the river Bistritza — Gulf of Salonika — population Greek, to be under the sole religious administration of the Patriarch of Constantinople, who would be the Metropolitan of that diocese.

B. The land east of the river Struma, bounded on the south by the shores of the Ægean Sea, on the east by the shores of the Black Sea, and on the north by the southern Bulgarian border, two autocephalous dioceses to be respectively under the Patriarch and under the autonomous Bulgarian Metropolitan (to be substituted at Constantinople in place of the Exarch).

The parishes in this district are so well defined that there is, and could be, no collision between the authority of the Patriarch and that of the Bulgarian Metropolitan — or Exarch.

C. The land to-day known as the Vilayet of Kossovo, the Sandjak of Novi-Bazar, and some districts of the Vilayet of Monastir, to be under a new Metropolitan, as an autonomous autocephalous Church district, a Serbian Metropolitan — the re-erection of the old Serbian Metrop-

olis or Patriarchat of Ipek, suppressed about 150 years ago,— with the See at Skoplya or Ipek.

D. The remaining land (Macedonia proper), to be made an autocephalous diocese under a new Metropolitan — the re-erection of the old Metropolis of Ochrida, suppressed 150 years ago.

This new organisation of Church administration throughout Macedonia, would as a matter of fact, and automatically, make, according to the practice in Turkey, the respective Metropolitans the heads, both religious and lay, of the Christians in their districts. All Church dependencies, such as schools, etc., would follow the new distributions.

In the constitution of the Turkish State, the Christians form "nations" or "milets" under the religious and lay authority of the head of their autonomous-autocephalous churches. The status personalis and all questions arising therefrom are judged by the courts of their churches. All that concerns the status realis goes before the Turkish authorities, as do all questions of public order.

The many judicial reforms imposed by Europe, by ignoring the bearing of this situation, have often brought only confusion and disorder into these matters, and therefore have failed.

There would be only two new autocephalous

Churches or church districts to be created, or, better said, to be re-erected, namely: the Sees of Ochrida — dating originally from the ninth century,— and the See of Ipek (originally dating from the thirteenth century as autocephal).

These creations or re-creations would be in keeping with the practice of the Orthodox Church. The Patriarch of Constantinople should recognise these newly created autocephal church bodies, and delegate to them all the ecclesiastical and lay power received by him through privileges dating from Sultan Mohammed in 1453 at the fall of Constantinople, and all the lay power acquired by him in absorbing those two former autocephal churches, as well as all other privileges granted to those churches by various Sultans and afterward absorbed by him. The Patriarch could relinquish those powers, as precedents have shown, against yearly monetary payments, or tribute.

To each of these autonomous Metropolitans, a European Commissioner should be attached, who would be the natural spokesman and representative of the Orthodox native Christians before all Turkish authority; and such a representative would have weight.

These proposed reforms and measures would do away with much of the evil prevailing in those

lands, and it is believed with some confidence, that normal peaceful conditions would ensue.

It is thought that H. I. M. the Sultan could grant such measures.

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

I am, Sir,

Your etc., etc.,

LAZAROVICH, *Delegate.*

2.

Memorandum submitted in the spring of 1904, through the good offices of Sir Henry Drummond Wolff, Privy Councillor, Ambassador, etc., etc., to H. R. & I. M., King Edward, and the British Government, and subsequently to the German Government:

. . . The proposal submitted is: To create a Federation of the Balkan States with Servia as basis.

Such a federation could only be formed with the support of at least one or two of the Great Powers, whose interests would thereby be served.

The maintenance of the Ottoman Empire in Europe has hitherto been an unavoidable part of British policy; there has been no other bulwark against northern aggression.

Political events, however, of the past few years, and the steadily growing sense of a community of interests and an increasing tendency towards national unity among the races of the Balkans, has developed a new situation and made

evident the possibility of forming those peoples into a new state strong enough to resist outside interference and to be substituted for the Ottoman rule in Europe.

The existence of such a state would do away forever with the necessity of upholding Turkish supremacy in the Near East.

The practical accomplishment of this plan involves the settlement of the Macedonian question, and the unification of the Serbian race into one state, as well as the unification of the Greek and Bulgarian races into their respective states.

The unification of the *Serbian* race would demand the gradual union with Serbia: of the Vilayet ol Kossovo (old Servia) districts in the northern part of the Vilayet of Monastir the Sandjak of Novi-Bazar, Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Principality of Montenegro, with extended border up to the River Drin.,— etc., etc.

The unification of the *Bulgarian* race would call for the annexation by Bulgaria of the Vilayet of Adrianople, and the eastern part of the Vilayet of Salonika.

The unification of the *Greek* race would necessitate the annexation by Greece of the southern part of the Vilayets of Monastir and Yanina, parts of Salonika, the Islands of Creta, and all

the other islands and the Greek coast of Asia Minor.

From the remainder of the Turkish European possessions should be created two states, namely:

1st. Albania, including part of the Vilayet of Scutari south of the River Drin, the northern part of the Vilayet of Yanina, and a district of the Vilayet of Monastir.

2nd. Macedonia, including the greater part of the Vilayet of Salonika and the greater part of the Vilayet of Monastir.

The first steps towards the federation of these peoples would be a settlement of the Macedonian question, providing for the ultimate separation of the different districts and provinces according to the allotment above suggested; that fixing of the borders of the new provinces in European Turkey would remove all cause of misunderstanding and friction which might otherwise be provoked by the rival aspirations of the surrounding states and impose upon them the recognition of the necessity for the creation of the autonomous States of Macedonia and Albania. . . .

. . . A scheme of settlement was proposed in November last, 1903, inviting H. I. M. the Sultan to, himself, grant a reasonable measure of self-government to the Christians of European

Turkey. Enclosed, is a copy of the outline of the project in the form in which it was accepted by H. E. the Turkish Ambassador in London for transmission to H. I. M. the Sultan, after unofficial discussion of its terms.

The project submitted was entirely workable and fair to Christians and Moslems alike. Its main points were: That H. I. M. the Sultan should of his own free will grant a statute for the government of his Christian subjects in European Turkey by Christians: making them responsible for their own administration and control, they still to remain under direct authority of H. I. M. the Sultan.

There should be created five provinces according to nationalities: —

Macedonia—Including a part of the Vilayet of Monastir and part of the Vilayet of Salonika — (Macedo-Slovenes).

Albania—Part of the Vilayet of Scutari, part of Vilayet of Yanina and a district of the Vilayet of Monastir. (Albanians.)

Thessaly-Epirus—Southern parts of the Vilayets of Monastir, Yanina and Salonika. (Greeks.)

Old Serbia—The Vilayet of Kossovo, sandjak of Novi-Bazar and part of the Vilayet of Monastir, and a district of Scutari. (Servians.)

Adrianople—The Vilayet of Adrianople and the eastern part of the Vilayet of Salonika. (Bulgarians.)

These provinces should be sub-divided into districts, Christian Districts and Moslem Districts: each district to be respectively under sole Christian or Moslem control and administration, according as the predominating population numerically should be Christian or Moslem.

For the preservation of public order, a military police force should be recruited each in its own district, and be under the authority of the Governor of that district. The organisation, drilling and commands of this force should be, during the first few years, entrusted to European officers.

For the administration of justice in the Christian districts, Christian courts should be instituted.

In order that these reforms should be applied without delay, it would be necessary that the Sultan should issue a Hatti-Shereef containing provisions for their immediate execution, making unnecessary any further orders or supplementary provisions from the Sultan for the accomplishment of the programme.

For that reason the Hatti-Shereef should contain: —

1. The creation of the provinces fixing the demarcation of their borders.

2. The subdivision of each province into Christian and Moslem districts, with provisional delimitations of their borders.

3. The necessary and detailed provisions for the creation of the new administrations in the Christian districts: Justice, Finance, Political Administration, Cult, and Education, Agriculture and Commerce, and all other branches of administration requisite to a self-governing body.

4. The appointment of the Christian Governors, with full investment of authority.

5. Provision for the immediate creation of all local representative bodies.

6. Provision for the immediate creation of a military police corps; its recruitment, formation and instruction and the nomination of its officers.

7. The necessary orders for the immediate evacuation by the Turkish troops of the Christian districts.

8. The naming of a mixed commission which should be composed of an equal number of Christian and Moslems, to visit each province to rectify the borders between the Christian and Mahomedan districts according to the reclamations of the inhabitants. The Commission should be

assisted locally in each province by a fixed number of Christian and Mahomedan notables elected from and by the inhabitants of the district.

9. The Hatti-Shereef should become law and enter into force on the day of its proclamation.

The powers should be asked to appoint a commission to supervise the execution of the Hatti-Shereef.

In order to provide for the initial expense of the new Christian administration it would be necessary to raise a loan.

To this scheme was added a suggested settlement of the religious troubles in these provinces. It was proposed that the Servian Church should be made autocephalous in Turkey and that an autonomous Archbishopric should be created in Macedonia.

Recent events have indicated that it would be impossible to obtain at once a grant from the Ottoman Government, containing so full and complete a programme, especially as it would meet with hostility from Russia, France, Austria and Italy. France can never be otherwise concerned as regards the Balkans than in putting another Power in the Mediterranean to counterbalance British influence in those waters. One of the foremost Frenchmen of the day said recently,

"France can never have any other policy in the Near East than to see Russia preponderant; Russia in Constantinople would be all to the advantage of France and would be the only safe balance to growing British pretensions in the Mediterranean."

The Ottoman Government has not the foresight to see that complete measures of reform would prolong its rule in Europe; and the chances of obtaining anything like an adequate degree of self-government as a grant, become more and more remote.

For that reason, other methods of securing the desired control must be adopted; the best hope of success lies in attacking first the most vulnerable point of the Turkish system, its financial weakness.

Some need of the Turkish Government must be satisfied in return for the means of obtaining a beginning of relief for the populations.

The most vexatory and the most ruinous of all the abuses by which the populations of European Turkey are oppressed is the system of the tax collection. The taxes in themselves are not exorbitant at the rate officially announced, but the abuses arising from the method in which they are collected is one of the chief causes of desperation among the people.

Appendix

At the present time the Turkish Exchequer is in pressing need of funds.

All Turkish resources now available have been already pledged to meet the services of the actual Ottoman debt, and the finding of a new resource capable of meeting a new loan would be apt to attract favorable attention in Constantinople, and would probably remove the difficulties which hitherto have obstructed all proposals of reform bearing upon tax-collecting or financial administration.

Those difficulties are the same to-day as they were before the Turco-Russian war, during the conference at Constantinople, the same difficulties lay at the base of the obstruction to the execution of the plan of reform prepared for European Turkey by the Congress of Berlin. The difficulty has always been, that the tax-collecting yields to a large class of Turkish officials rich revenues and has formed the source of many of the fortunes of the rich Pashas.

David Urquhart, in 1833, declared that the autonomy of the local administration is absolutely necessary to the well-being of the Turkish population. Urquhart found that all reforms left to be applied by Turkish officials were only used by them as a means of enriching themselves at the expense of the people.

On the occasion of the Constantinople conference, the Porte rejected the European reform scheme, repulsing especially that section concerning finance, and a Turkish personage offered the following explanation: "How can we accord a system of administration which would have the effect of reducing to misery about 30,000 of us? How would we live and what would become of us?" This speech is recorded in an official report; it embodies, no less now than it did then, the main difficulty in the way of the application of all schemes of reform for European Turkey.

That obstruction could only be removed by either wiping out completely the Turkish rule in Europe, or by profiting by the financial distress of the Ottoman Government.

To create a new resource making it possible to raise a new loan for the Turkish Government, would, according to the means I suggest, open up to the Turkish Government the prospect of raising other loans upon the same resources, at a later period, and be a further inducement to the Ottoman Government to accept the terms proposed.

The honest and efficient farming of the Tithes could be made to furnish the desired resource; also, the control of the tithe-farming would be a

means in hand of at once relieving the people from the abuses and burdens of the present corrupt administration.

That control would lead to more extended measure, of improvement in the agricultural and economic conditions, and would, by degrees, permit the development and gradual accomplishment of the original programme of self-government for, at least, the Christian populations of these lands.

The object of the present project is: —

To find guarantees for a loan to be made to Turkey, with the aim of inducing the Turkish Government to hand over to a syndicate the reorganisation of the present system of collecting the direct taxes in European Turkey. . . .

. . . The object of this scheme is to relieve the people from the abuses of the present system as practised by the Turkish Administration, and is intended to be the first step towards the practical solution of the Near Eastern question.

Statistics show that such a loan could be raised, and tax-collecting managed in such a way as to guarantee its service, relieve the oppression, pay the usual returns to the Imperial treasury, pay costs of collection service, pay the service of the loan and leave a surplus for the improvement of the agricultural and commercial conditions of the country.

The direct taxes of the Turkish Empire include:—

1.	A ground and house tax (Verghi) excluding Constantinople	£T. 2,236,092
2.	Income tax	500,000
3.	Tithes	4,689,000
4.	Sheep, camels, and oxen.....	1,937,849
5.	Hogs	16,000
	Total direct taxation.....	£T.9,568,941

With the exception of the military tax, borne solely by the Christians, and the stamp duties, both not included in this calculation, the direct taxation rates at 40.21 piasters per head, of which 20.5 piasters are produced by the tithes.

The population of European Turkey (excluding Constantinople, which has a special system of taxation) is 4,950,300 persons, which, at the rate of 40.21 piasters per head, gives a yearly return of £T.1,014,811.5 (these figures exclude the military tax and the stamp duties).

The financial administration is organised according to Vilayets, each Vilayet having its budget and autonomous administration.

The Verghi, the income tax and the tax on cat-

tle and hogs are paid directly to the Imperial treasury through a tax collector who is the agent of the treasury.

The tithes are auctioned off in advance of the harvest to persons who in turn re-sell their contracts to other subcontractors.

The 20.5 piasters per head is reckoned upon the sum which the Government receives and not upon the sum paid by the taxpayer to the collectors.

The present system involves the employment of a number of middlemen or exploiters, and their gains and costs of collection.

The tithes rate in Turkey is 12.1 per cent. of the value of the harvest, which is estimated immediately before gathering by the tax collector, and the estimate, depending upon his discretion and good will, varies accordingly.

During the Turkish Rule in Bosnia, the Consular statistics showed that though the tithes were officially set at $\frac{1}{10}$ or 10 percent., the taxpayer was forced to give the collector $\frac{1}{8}$ and often $\frac{1}{7}$ or from $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to 14.28 per cent. The auction price paid by the collector for the contract represented generally only 8 per cent., and sometimes 9 per cent., but never more.

At present the direct taxes bring in about 8.85 Frs. (40.21 piasters), per head; of this the tithes

are represented by 20.5 piasters, or 4.715 fr., the other direct taxes by 4.135 fr.

In Bulgaria where the agricultural conditions are similar and the same taxes exist (tithes having been replaced by a ground rent tax of 10 per cent. of the harvest, paid in kind or in specie), and where the abuses of collection have been suppressed, the State received 10.40 fr. direct taxes, which is 1.85 fr. more than that received by Turkey, although the rate of taxation is less in Bulgaria (tithes). The Bulgarian rate is 10 per cent., the Turkish tithes 12.1 per cent. Estimated on the basis of 1.55 difference, which is the lowest possible, the surplus which never reaches the Imperial treasury is £287,000 (sterling): that surplus would guarantee the service of the loan £5,000,000, which would demand £250,000 yearly, the rest would more than cover the expenses of the administration, collection of taxes, etc.

If the Bulgarian 10.40 fr. is considered as a 10 per cent. levy, the 8.85 fr. (Macedonian) would represent a levy of 8.5 per cent.

The tithes (Macedonian) if properly and honestly administered with the present levy of 12.1 per cent. would give 6.94 fr., instead of the present yield of 4.71 fr. The surplus in that case would be £647,598, an amount which prob-

ably represents more nearly the amount at present paid by the taxpayer in excess of what the treasury receives; this reckoning is made on the supposition that the tax collector is honest, brings no undue pressure to bear upon the peasant and levies only the legal amount (12.1 per cent.).

It is, however, a fact of public notoriety that the dishonest administration of this service is one of the chief causes of the desperate situation in European Turkey.

I would suggest, as a system of tax collecting, the reversion to a method which was for a short period in past times tried with success, namely: that the headmen of the villages were allowed to collect and hand over the taxes directly to the Imperial Treasury. . . .

. . . As an example of the relative values of the method at present employed and that above referred to: in the district of Argyro-Castro in European Turkey, the Verghi immobilier and the tithes brought under the method at present prevailing 11,000 piasters; but when for a short period these taxes were collected by the headmen of the village and paid directly by him into the treasury, the return was 46,000 piasters.

The system of personal collection of the taxes by the people themselves, corresponds to the wishes of the populations and has been made the

subject of frequent petitions to the Imperial Government. Those petitions have not been granted because the farming of the taxes has been a source of personal enrichment to the officials.

As the different nationalities in European Turkey are correctly represented by the formation suggested of new provinces, each having to a certain extent its own more or less special economic customs, it would be easy to shape the provinces on a national basis.

I am, etc.,

Your etc., etc.,

LAZAROVICH.

APPENDIX C

The projected Servian Canal to join the Danube River with the Ægean Sea.[1]

To form in conjunction with the Central European Waterway-systems, a continuous and direct water route from the Baltic and North Seas to the Mediterranean and Suez.

In the spring of 1909 propositions for concessions to construct a Servian water-way based on engineers' reports, preliminary surveys, works and projects, with table of estimates as furnished to Prince Lazarovich by the foremost engineer of Servia, Mr. N. I. Stamenkovich, Professor of Hydro-Technics at the University of Belgrade, were laid before the Servian Government by Mr. V. R. Savich (since then, Chief of a Department in the Servian Foreign Office) acting on behalf of Prince Lazarovich.

This project is to construct a water-way 382

[1] See U. S. A. Daily Consular and Trade Reports, Washington, D. C., July 7, 1909.

miles in length from the river Danube to the port of Salonika on the Ægean Sea, navigable for boats of 1000 tons' carrying capacity, and for that purpose to utilise the river Morava in Servia and the river Vardar, by connecting them with a canal across the low watershed of Preshevo, where both rivers rise and mingle their head-waters. From Preshevo the Morava flows almost due north into the Danube, while the Vardar takes a straight course nearly due south to the Ægean Sea.

That water-route will lie within the great north-to-south valley from the Danube to the Ægean Sea, which forms one of the most impressive geographical features of the Balkan peninsula, and through which runs the railroad from Belgrade, on the Danube, to Salonika, following the ancient route of trade. The Bay of Salonika is formed by nature to be one of the most magnificent harbours of the world.

The project presents no engineering difficulties: the average fall of the Morava River is 0.78%, while that of the Vardar is 1.13%.

The total extent of surface drained into the Morava River is 14,773 square miles, and the total extent of area drained into the Vardar is 9,780 square miles.

A copious and sufficient supply of water is

available throughout the year in all seasons for the entire water-way.

The work necessary for the construction of the water-way consists in:—

1. Regulation of the lower courses of both rivers.

2. The canalisation of a part of each river: and

3. The construction of a navigable canal to connect them on the Preshevo water-shed, with a reservoir or artificial lake to feed the canal.

The projected Servian water-way will, when constructed, complete the great central European inland water-way systems: The DANUBE-ODER Canal, the DANUBE-MOLDAU-ELBE Canal, and the DANUBE-MAIN-RHINE Canal: will drain the greatest industrial centres of mid-Europe, and will shorten the trade water-route between the Suez Canal and the ports of Antwerp, Rotterdam, Bremen, Hamburg, Stettin, etc., on the North and Baltic Seas, via Gibraltar by 1600 miles, and via the inland water-ways, the Danube, the Black Sea and Constantinople, by nearly half the present length of the route.

Boats using the projected water-way through Servia would avoid the difficulties and the great expenditure of both time and money connected

with the shipping traffic on that part of the Danube River known as the "Iron Gates" and the dangers of Black Sea navigation.

Enormous sums have been expended by the Austro-Hungarian governments in attempts to regulate and make navigable that part of the Danube, but the result has proved unsatisfactory.

A large portion of central European commerce going to the Mediterranean and Suez is forced to pass by way of the northern seas and the long route of Gibraltar.

The gravity of this problem can be judged by two projects for avoiding the lower Danube, which have been offered to the consideration of the Austrian and the Hungarian Parliaments. One of these calls for the construction of a canal across the Alps from Vienna to Trieste, to be half canal and half ship-rail, at an estimated cost of $100,000,000. The other scheme aims at connecting the river Sava, in Croatia, with the port of Fiume on the Adriatic, necessitating a tunnel of 16 miles, bearing a canal and piercing the ranges of the Dinaric Alps. No official estimates for this proposition have been published, as its feasibility is questioned by the authorities.

The traffic estimated as available for these

projected routes based on the present shipment by Hamburg and Triest from and to the Austro-Hungarian industrial centres alone is 4,000,000,000 tons yearly.

Most, if not all, of this tonnage could reasonably be estimated as available for the proposed Servian water-way. The commerce from German centres would also find its advantage in using the shortened and cheapened new water-way toward the eastern Mediterranean.

The traffic which at present is forced to pass via the Iron Gates of the Danube to the Black Sea is 2,000,000,000 tons yearly. The estimates for the Servian project have left out of account any local traffic to be expected from Servian commerce, though it is recognised that the water-way cannot fail to be an important factor in the development of those regions.

The history of canals has shown in every case that the construction of a shorter and cheaper water-way has greatly increased the traffic and has created traffic where none existed before.

To cite the Suez Canal as an example: In 1870 there passed through the canal 436,609 registered tons: in 1883, 5,777,862 tons: and in 1907, 20,500,000 tons.

The history of the canalisation of the river Main from Mainz to Frankfurt in Germany

gives an idea of the increase on inland water-ways: In the year of its completion, 1887, it carried 156,000 tons of traffic, which rose to 1,087,000 tons in 1899.

The total cost of the Servian water-way, from the Danube to the Ægean Sea, according to the reports and table of estimates furnished by the engineers and experts engaged for that purpose, would be $65,000,000 — inclusive of all preliminary and accessory works, appropriations, etc., and 4% on the capital required during the estimated period of construction.

These estimates were based upon the actual cost of canal-construction in Germany, where some of the conditions were less favourable than those to be obtained for the Danube-Ægean project.

The sum required yearly, after the completion of the canal, to meet all working expenses and 4% interest on capital is estimated at $3,456,000 — which would be covered by tolls, sale of water-power and income on land and water-rights.

The traffic necessary to insure profit, if reckoned on tolls alone, would have to be 4,000,000 tons yearly. However, tolls would not be the sole source of income, as it is apparent that large returns would result from the sale of water-

The Existing Inland Waterways of Central Europe Navigable for Boats of 1000 Tons, and Projected Danube = Aegean Sea Canal.

rights for electric power-works and other purposes.

As the projected Servian water-way from the Danube to Salonika will, in conjunction with the Danube-Elbe, the Danube-Oder and the Danube-Main-Rhine canals, tap the richest and most extensive productive and industrial areas of central Europe, and will furnish the cheapest and shortest route for their export and import traffic with the Near and Far East, it appears safe to predict that this water-way will early command the tonnage of traffic necessary to amply justify the Servian Government in hastening its construction.

DATE DUE

THE KING'S LIBRARY
3000061710